

THE
MONTHLY REPOSITORY
OF
Theology and General Literature.

No. XXXVI.]

DECEMBER.

[Vol. III.]

BIOGRAPHY.

MEMOIR OF THE LATE REV. THEOPHILUS LINDSEY, A.M. BY
MRS. CAPPE*.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

SIR, York, Nov. 30, 1808. **Y**OU have desired, I would furnish you with a Memoir of my late most worthy and highly honoured friend, the Reverend Theophilus Lindsey: but it would be impossible to compress the events of a life such as his, had I abilities and leisure for the undertaking, within the narrow limits of a periodical publication. The utmost therefore I can attempt is to give a short outline of a few interesting circumstances, in order to assist such of your readers as are unacquainted with them, in forming some idea of the extraordinary excellence of his character: and having enjoyed the unspeakable privilege of his friendship and that of Mrs. Lindsey, for a period of more than forty years, it gives me some satisfaction, not however unmixed with sentiments of tender regret, to add my testimony such as it is, to the general tribute of affection and respect which cannot fail of being paid to his memory.

Devoted to the sanctuary from his earliest youth, by a mother eminently pious, the wish of whose heart it was, that she might live to see her son a minister of the gospel; engaged as his own mind had ever been in the same honourable cause; endowed with talents of no ordinary occurrence, and anxious to make the necessary attainments which should qualify him in future for extensive usefulness, the highest expectations were early formed by his friends of the eminence to which he would one day attain, and his uncommon progress in learning,

* The Editor cannot refrain from expressing in the name of his readers, his thanks to Mrs. Cappe, for her obliging and prompt acquiescence in his wish that she would favour the world, through the medium of the *Monthly Repository*, with some account of the earlier part of the life of her late venerable friend. "This lady," says Mr. Belsham, in his Memoir of Mr. Lindsey, attached to his Funeral Sermon, p. 58, alluding to Mrs. Cappe, "was the early and intimate friend of Mr. and Mrs. Lindsey, and to her honour be it spoken, almost alone, remained firmly attached to them in their change of circumstances."

his piety and exemplary conduct even whilst at school, and afterwards at the University, gave them every reason to believe that their expectations were well-founded. The Huntingdon family, and Lady Anne Hastings in particular, a lady eminent for her piety and many other fine endowments, were his earliest patrons; with them he constantly spent the summer vacations, and his amiable manners, cheerful disposition and unaffected humility secured him that interest in their hearts, for which his literary progress and the high character given of him by his tutors, had paved the way. Already in their imagination was he seated in the episcopal chair, and being introduced by Lord Huntingdon, on his leaving Cambridge, to Algernon Duke of Somerset as his domestic chaplain, no doubt remained of his future high destination. In this illustrious house he soon became a great favourite; was entrusted with papers of the highest importance to the family, and considered by them in the light of a confidential friend. He was with them at the time of the Duke's death, whom he affectionately attended in his last illness; and after that event still continued to reside in the family as chaplain to the Duchess. This Lady, when Countess of Hartford, was much celebrated for her wit and beauty, and although her brightest days were now passed, she had still the first characters at her table, whether for station, talents or literature, to all of whom her chaplain was introduced, as a young man of the greatest hopes and expectations. And as a foretaste of the good fortune which awaited him, an old lady who was the intimate friend of the Duchess, gave him her right of alternate presentation to the valuable living of Chew Magna, in _____ of which however he never made the slightest pecuniary advantage. The occasion of his leaving the Duchess, was in order to accompany her grandson, the present Duke of Northumberland, then a youth at Eton School, and whose constitution was very delicate, to the South of France, for the recovery of his health; the family not daring to entrust him to the care of any one but Mr. Lindsey. They remained there two years, and the faithful tutor brought back his pupil in recovered health, and so much improved in his learning, that he took a higher form at Eton on his return, than any of his contemporaries who had remained there the whole time. During this interval, the Duchess of Somerset died, leaving it in charge with her daughter, the late Duchess of Northumberland, as her last injunction, to provide for Mr. Lindsey. On his return, the valuable living of Kirby Whiske, in the North Riding of this county, and in the gift of that family, happening to become vacant, Mr. Lindsey was inducted to it to hold for a relation of their's—of the name of Revely, but the young gentleman dying before he was of proper age to be ordained, it was offered to Mr. L. in perpetuity. This offer Mr. L. would probably have accepted, had not Lord Huntingdon made a point of his taking the living of Piddletown, in Dorsetshire, which happened to be vacant at the time, and which was in his own gift; it was not so valuable as Kirby

Whiske, but that was considered as of no moment to one, who would soon obtain much higher preferment, and the family of Hastings could not endure the idea of his owing his first permanent establishment to any one but themselves. Mr. Lindsey's predecessor at Piddletown, Dr. Dawney, had lived there in considerable splendour. He had opened a bowling-green, and kept a public day once or twice in the week, on which occasions he entertained the neighbouring gentlemen. His successor, although no enemy to cheerful society or innocent amusement on proper occasions, did not think a life like this exactly suited to a minister of the gospel. He set out therefore, on a quite different plan; devoting his time principally to the study of the scriptures and to the good of the people committed to his care. This decision formed so immediately, was surely very extraordinary in a young man accustomed to move in the first circles; whose own natural disposition was not unaspiring, and whose refined taste and polished manners gave him a high relish for elegant society. But his whole heart and mind was set in conformity to the elevated sentiment of his favourite Milton, in his *Samson Agonistes*, "to learn and do what might be *Christian virtues*;" and this was the talisman which preserved him from the contagion of vanity or worldly ambition, in a soil where they are usually most prolific. During his retirement at Piddletown, Mr. Lindsey's first doubts seem to have arisen on the subject of the trinity, and as he tells us in the last chapter of his *Apology*, "compelled him to a closer study of the scriptures with regard to it*." He proceeds in that interesting work to state the result, and to enumerate some of the arguments by which he was prevailed upon at that time to continue in the church, and by which, he says, he brought himself in time "to remain tolerably quiet and easy in it." A few years after this, in August 1760, he married Miss Hannah Elsworth, daughter in law of the late eminent Archdeacon Blackburne, of Richmond, in Yorkshire; and in the year 1763, the living of Catterick becoming vacant by the death of my father, the Rev. Jeremiah Harrison, Mr. L. made interest to obtain an exchange, not with any view to greater pecuniary advantage, for Piddletown was in every respect preferable, but that he might be nearer the relations of Mrs. Lindsey, and especially that he might be near Archdeacon Blackburne. Here it was, in the following year, that the writer of this imperfect Memoir, had first the privilege of being introduced to the subject of it. Young at the time, uninformed and accustomed to the society of those among my general acquaintance who form their estimate of right and wrong in the scale of commonly received opinion, I was little qualified to comprehend, or duly to appreciate the full excellence of such a character; yet I was exceedingly interested by the amiable, unassuming disposition of my new friend, by the patience with which he endeavoured to set right every mistake or prejudice, by his total disregard of every personal indulgence, and by his unwearied solicitude to make all around him

* *Apology*, p. 225.

good and happy. It was not true of him as of some eminent characters, that like certain large cities, they appear noble only when seen at a distance, for his habits and temper were as amiable as his principles were excellent. I was very frequently a visitor in the family during the ten years he resided at Catterick, and I never once saw the least tendency to fretfulness or caprice, or an approach to ill humour on any occasion whatever. It was the constant subject of his thoughts in what manner he could most effectually benefit the people committed to his care, whether in their temporal or eternal interests; and to this end a plan of great frugality was adopted by himself and Mrs. Lindsey, (who perfectly acceded to his views) that they might have the power of distributing books in aid of personal instruction, of giving medicines to the sick, and food to those "who were ready to perish with hunger." But it was on a Sunday evening chiefly, when the labours of the day were over—a day devoted to the public and private instruction of the congregation at large, of the children of those who composed it, of servants and others who attended in his own study,—that the irradiations of a mind so heavenly were the most striking. Never shall I forget, as he walked across the room with cheerful and animated step, unmindful of weariness or fatigue, discoursing perhaps on the beauties of creation, the goodness of God every where manifested, the perfect example of Christ, or on the heroism and virtue of martyrs and confessors gone to their reward; how his eyes would sparkle with delight. When, he would say, will the happy time arrive that all men will be virtuous and happy?

Although Mr. L. had so far quieted his scruples as to continue in the church, he had firmly resolved never to accept any farther preferment, and had refused repeated offers from others, but especially from the Duchess of Northumberland, who was exceedingly solicitous to fulfil the promise made to her dying parent of placing him in affluence. At length, when the Duke was appointed to the viceroyship of Ireland, she wrote to make him an offer which she hoped he would not refuse, of being appointed the Duke's first chaplain, the certain prelude to a bishoprick:—this, she said, did not involve in it fresh subscription to the articles or new engagements of any kind, and that, far from doing him a favour, the Duke and herself should consider his acquiescence as a favour conferred on themselves—that they should want the society of so kind and faithful a friend in a situation so new and untried. —I was at Catterick at the time, and I remember the letter.—Mr. Lindsey's reply was full of gratitude for the offered kindness, but the refusal was firm and decisive, for he had then formed the resolution, if the clerical petition at that time before parliament, should be rejected, to relinquish the church altogether. The Duchess made one effort more to settle a pension on him and Mrs. L. for their joint lives on the Irish establishment. But this also was refused in a manner not less firm than the former.—What benefit, he said, had he or Mrs. L. ever conferred on the Irish, that should entitle them to such a remuneration!

The time now drew near when the fate of the petition would be finally decided.—Mr. L. had long anticipated the probable result, and was making silent and gradual preparation for the event which was to ensue;—not however by saving a purse of money, for both he and Mrs. L. continued their accustomed charities, and had this year the additional expence of inoculating all the poor children in the parish, the small pox being then very fatal in the neighbourhood. Mrs. L. attended them in person, gave them all their medicines, and was so successful in her attendance, that she did not lose a single patient. The final close of Mr. Lindsey's labours in the established church, together with the reasons which led to it, are detailed at some length in the "Apology," already referred to, and are well known to the public. But no one perhaps who was not a witness of the scene, can duly appreciate the difficulty and magnitude of the sacrifice. Some of his feelings on this trying occasion, are affectingly adverted to in the following passage of his farewel address to his sorrowing parishioners, which he who can read unmoved must have a heart of no common texture. "To leave" he says, "a station of ease and affluence, and to have to combat with various straights and hardships of an uncertain world, is but a dark prospect. But we must willingly submit to this hard lot, when not to be avoided without deserting our duty to God and his truth. And we have great encouragement given us by our divine master and saviour Christ, Matthew x. 32. 'Whosoever shall confess me before men, him will I also confess before my father who is in heaven.' And Mark x. 29, 30. 'It is of small concern in what outward circumstances we pass over the short term of life, if we can but obtain that blessed approbation in the end—'Well done, good and faithful servant;—enter thou into the joy of thy Lord.' Matthew xxv. 23." But these risks and privations were far from being all which on this memorable occasion he was called upon to endure:—the coolness of some; the direct opposition of others, with whom he had long been intimately connected; the alienation of friends, and the ridicule and contumely of enemies, were all brought against him to destroy his peace of mind and to attempt the ruin of his character. Respecting the first, for a very short time they did succeed. But the attack upon the latter was instantly repelled by the faithful testimony of a life uniformly spent in the constant discharge of every Christian virtue. On leaving Catterick, Mr. Lindsey's furniture, plate and china were all sold to defray the expence of their journey to London, and to provide for the subsistence of himself and Mrs. Lindsey after their arrival there, until some other plan could be adopted. Even the greater part of his valuable library which he had been many years in collecting, was sent to York and disposed of. Well do I remember his farewel sermon, taken from the 20th of Acts and the 32nd verse, and preached to a very crowded congregation, and never did I witness or experience such heart-rending sorrow:—the preacher alone was calm and collected, for it was extraordinary that with a sensibility the most

acute, he possessed the most perfect self-command—with a temper the most mild and condescending, a firmness and courage where duty was concerned, that nothing could surprise or subdue. It is remarkable that not one of his former friends came forward on this trying occasion to his assistance and support. This honour was reserved by the providence of God to be conferred on strangers. Eventually however, he was supported, and that amply: but here Mr. Editor I must conclude. The subsequent part of the history of my late venerable and invaluable friend, is well known to most of your readers. With what acceptance he preached until his 70th year in Essex Street, to a respectable and enlightened audience; how much he was esteemed and beloved, by a very extensive circle of friends and acquaintance; with what alacrity and ardour he constantly persevered in every good word and work; and with what patience, resignation, and even cheerfulness he bore the many and increasing infirmities

of declining age, ever repeating, that “what God wills is best,” let others witness, for they can testify.—Of what moment is it to him now, that his early path of duty was dark and difficult? But I retract the inquiry; it was and ever will be of the utmost moment. Devoted as he was through the whole of a long life to the service of his Maker; following as he did with patient and unwearied steps, the illustrious example of his Divine Master; he will on this account take his place proportionably higher; his piety, fortitude, and integrity, tried and perfected in the furnace of affliction, will shine with brighter lustre; his crown of glory will be more resplendent, and when ages of ages shall have rolled away, the glorious career will still proceed, and he will approximate for ever nearer and still nearer to the eternal fountain of all perfection! I am Sir,

Your constant reader,

And sincere well-wisher,

CATH. CAPPEL.

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

MR. MORTIMER, ON THE REV. J. EDWARDS'S DEATH.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

Wareham,

SIR,

Nov. 19, 1808.

“*The manner*” in which Mr. Kentish has animadverted in your last number, (p. 562.) on the notice of the death of the Rev. John Edwards, inserted in the *Monthly Repository* for September last, induces me as the writer of that article, in vindication of

my own character, to assert most positively, that the facts as there stated, are perfectly correct.

I was not only officially employed on the coroner's inquest, but had other means of making myself well acquainted with the circumstances, which led to the death of that unfortunate gentleman: Yet Mr. Kentish after insinuating

that my statement was not true, on referring to his sermon on the "on the authority of a very respectable correspondent at Exeter, and after a careful examination of his circumstantial narrative of that event," comes to this conclusion—"that Mr. Edwards lost his life while he was bathing." same melancholy event, (lately published,) I find that he not only admits this, but much more, by saying that "the seeds of this grievous malady appear to have been sown in his (Mr. Edwards's) constitution."

Now Mr. Editor, I must ask your candid readers, whether after perusing *my* statement, they did not come to the *same* conclusion? For what did I state? Why, that Mr. Edwards found a momentary benefit from the water, and that *bathing led to his death!* It is true, I stated further, that Mr. Edwards left his home labouring under a mental disease; and this is what I first supposed upon reading Mr. Kentish's letter, that he meant to doubt; but up-

I am therefore really at a loss to divine, what could be Mr. Kentish's motive in impeaching my veracity, and I am compelled, (unwillingly I own,) to resort to this mode of justifying myself, hoping that after having admitted Mr. Kentish's letter, your candour will not refuse this a place in your next number.

I am, Sir,

Your obliged servant,

JOHN MORTIMER.

MR. EDDOWES, OF AMERICA, ON THE UNITARIAN SOCIETY,
PHILADELPHIA.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

Philadelphia,
SIR, August 26, 1808.

Your Repository for May has just now reached me, in which, under the department of "Intelligence," &c. I find some strictures upon the code of Regulations adopted by the *first society of Unitarian Christians* in this city. The complexion of these strictures is such, that as a member of the society, and of the committee appointed to prepare and report those Regulations for their consideration, I feel myself constrained to take some notice of them.

In the fourth paragraph, which wears a surprising air of inconsistency with the rest of the arti-

cle, it is observed, that "the rules reduce the authority of the pastor to a degree, to which few ministers on this side the Atlantic would stoop." If your Intelligence be an Episcopalian, either catholic or protestant, it is consistent in him to hold the doctrine of an authority originally inherent in the clerical character, and to stigmatize us as having profanely combined to pull it down. We know well enough upon what ground it is thought to stand, and we do not wonder that any relinquishment of its imaginary prerogatives should suggest the idea of *stooping*. But if he be a Dissenter, and of course the professed advocate of religious liberty,

it might have occurred to him, that although a Christian society may exist without any person at their head in the ostensible character of pastor, yet if the office be separated from the society, it becomes a mere nullity—a thing that is not. The unavoidable conclusion is, that it derives all its importance from the people. Being associated in their corporate capacity, and fully competent to act effectively, they propose to A, B, or C, who is at that juncture possessed of no official character whatever with respect to *them*, that he shall undertake certain duties upon certain conditions; and when the agreement is complete the relation commences. But when this is done, is there not, it may be asked, an authority incident to the office which it is the right and duty of the incumbent to exercise? Undoubtedly there is; and all parties with one consent resort to the gospel to ascertain its nature and extent. There we find that the principal distinction affected by Christ and his Apostles, with all their extraordinary qualifications, was that of *ministers* or *servants* (though the first of these terms seems to have lost its original meaning), and the authority they delegated, chiefly that of rebuking flagrant offenders, and putting men of different ranks and degrees in mind of the duties peculiar to their stations*. Now, Sir, unless we are to revert to the exploded notion of direct apostolic succession, whose authority on these occasions, or on others wherein it is proper for him to interfere, is he exercising? Clearly not *his own*, but that of the society, who have entrusted him with it for these very purposes, whose purity, honour and credit he is bound to consult, and to whose most important interests he is *ministering* by such a faithful discharge of his duty; and if in this he be not countenanced by the “*body of the church*,” in vain may he look for support in any imagined sanctity or official importance of the clerical character. Our sentiments on this head are fully expressed in the “*Explanatory Observations*,” p. 18. We have great reason for complaint that they should have been entirely passed over without notice; and we indignantly disclaim the intention of imposing any conditions which would derogate from that high degree of estimation, in which we profess to hold the faithful, honest and intrepid Christian minister.

If the pastor possess an authority superior to, or even co-ordinate with the church in matters of internal regulation or discipline, much more may it be thought to belong to him in those of doctrine. But this I find expressly disclaimed in p. 241. of the same Repository for May, by one whose eminent abilities and respectable character might appear to give him no common title to it. He says, “Unitarians will not adopt implicitly any doctrines which their teachers may advance without examining how far they agree with what they

* Paul even seems to think it possible that the office itself may become unnecessary, and work its own extinction, when he says (Eph. iv. 11, 12, 13.) “He gave apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints—TILL WE ALL come in the unity of the faith, &c. unto a perfect man.”

judge to be the dictates of reason and the discoveries of revelation. And may they ever retain this honourable distinction, this inquisitive and independent spirit."

But if it be with surprise that I find the obsolete claims of ecclesiastical authority advocated in a publication like your's, it is with equal grief that I read in the next sentence, "Provision is even made (which is surely incompatible with the respect due to a Christian teacher) for preferring complaints against him."—Is it possible, sir, that your intelligencer could, as he has said, have the Constitution in his hands, and misinterpret it so wilfully and palpably? Or are we a set of fools and madmen who pull down with one hand what we build up with the other? "These complaints," says he, "are to be made in writing, and signed by at least three persons; they are then to be laid before the committee of management, who are to present them to the whole society, &c." Could he mean *purposely* to omit the words "who shall take it into mature consideration, and if the complaint be persisted in"? If any doubt could exist, for what intent the committee are to take these complaints into consideration, a solution might be found in Sect. 6, of Art. II. where it is directed that similar complaints concerning the conduct of any member, are to be exhibited to the committee that they may *employ every proper means to remove the cause of offence*; and it is not till their endeavours prove ineffectual that the case is to be brought before the society at large. By this

distorted representation, what was honestly intended, and would effectually operate as a shield and defence to the pastor's character, against the shafts of calumny, or the petulance of ignorance and self-conceit, is made to appear as an invitation to their attacks! Undoubtedly, any such provision would have been unnecessary, if the supposed sanctity and immaculacy of the clerical character were sufficient to awe the tongue of slander into silence, and to keep impertinence at a distance. But experience proves the contrary; and it has been found that for want of a precaution of this nature the comfort and usefulness of many a pious and worthy minister have been destroyed. On the other hand, as *to err is human*, his own conduct may not have been free from blame; but no such thing seems to have entered into the imagination of your intelligencer. *The respect due to a Christian teacher*, is to cover, like charity, a multitude of sins; and, in contradiction to every constitutional precedent in this country, we are expected to admit the maxim that certain official functions carry with them an exemption from the possibility of doing wrong.

After cursorily and partially mentioning the proceedings that are to take place previous to a final decision upon any complaint against the pastor, your intelligencer peremptorily avers, that "this is overdoing democracy itself." Democracy, sir, on your side the Atlantic, may possibly mean *mob-government*; and in this sense it is probably intended to be applied to the proceedings of a society professedly Christian.

With suitable acknowledgments them, are supposed to be a herd for the compliment, I beg leave of vulgar, ignorant wretches, to observe, that in this part of made to be governed and directed the world we have more correct by the nod of their ghostly father, ideas of democracy. It is a fundamental principle, solemnly recognized both by our general and state constitutions. But we do not carry it to extremes. We qualify it by representation, because we know that however proper it might be in an abstract view for every individual to decide in person upon whatever is to affect his interests as a member of the community, in a large one, this is impossible. Not so in a smaller, where upon proper and important occasions the principle may be resorted to in its simple and unrestricted form. The constitution of our society contemplates several cases of this kind, that now under consideration among others; and then, every individual (legally qualified) has his vote. This is the utmost point to which, as I have always understood, a matter of this sort can be carried. But your intelligencer, in the profundity of his wisdom, has discovered that our proceedings go a length *even beyond this*. I might with equal propriety speak of nonsense *overdoing nonsense itself*.

But the whole of this *isolated* passage is in as direct hostility to the principles of rational religion and liberty, as it is with justice and candor. The clergy are held up as a superior order, while the people, even the best informed of

them, are supposed to be a herd of vulgar, ignorant wretches, made to be governed and directed by the nod of their ghostly father, or else continually on the watch, that they may have whereof to accuse him, and the committee the medium through which their malignant purposes are to be carried into effect.

I will not, sir, for a moment doubt of your disposition to repair the injury you have (*inadvertently*, as I am willing to believe) done our society with the public, by a mutilated quotation from our Constitution. I have therefore to request that you will do us justice to an equal extent, by publishing the instrument itself entire*. We are not infallible—we may have committed errors, and we cheerfully submit to the judgment of our fellow Christians; but let us not be condemned upon *ex parte* evidence.

I cannot conclude without observing that the writer of the private letter you mention, as he has mistaken the circumstance relative to the country of the person alluded to, so he may have misinterpreted the motives which appear to him to have governed his conduct. As a *private letter* however, it is evident it was not intended for publication, and it is to be regretted that such an use was made of it.

I remain, Sir,

Your's respectfully,
RA. EDDOWES.

* The "Constitution" entire will be found in our Intelligence Department, the first article.
EDIT.

QUESTION TO CHARICLO.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

SIR, Nov. 22, 1808. high priests were put up within
Your new correspondent Cha- it." See M. Rep. p. 541, of the
riclo, has advanced a number of present volume.
strange assertions, supported by P. S. It may not be unaccept-
as strange pretensions to reasoning. able to your correspondents who,
I believe these may be safely left a few months ago, laudably pro-
to the common sense and the posed some public monument of
scriptural knowledge of any of honour to LOCKE, to be informed
your readers. But he has thought that a very noble and impressive
proper to make one assertion on statue of him, by Roubilliac, in
a plain matter of fact, on which a Grecian habit, stands in a con-
I request your proposal to him of spicuous part of the college from
the following question. which he was, so much to his

One who has not long ago care- honour, expelled, Christ-church,
fully read the whole nine books Oxford. It was presented to
of Herodotus, would be obliged the college by a gentleman of the
if Chariclo will inform the read- name of *Lock*. The difference
ers of the M. Rep. in what part of orthography in the names,
of his history, that author, seems to shew that the donor was
"speaking of the temple of Jeru- no relative to the illustrious logi-
salem, says, the images of the cian. S.

GENERAL ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR OF THE DOCTRINE OF
MATERIALISM.

[Concluded from p. 595.]

15th. The resurrection of ing of his mighty power, which
Christ, is represented in the New he wrought in Christ, when he
Testament, as involving a most raised him up from the dead, and
amazing display of the Divine set him at his own right hand in
power; and it is not unfrequent, the heavenly places."
that the moral resurrection of the This same "*mighty power*"
Gentile world is illustrated by it: is referred to by St. Paul in some
hence, the apostle in expressing other of his epistles, and is re-
his devotional wishes for the presented as a power, by which
Christian church at Ephesus, Christ would be qualified to raise
prays, that they might apprehend the dead at the last day; as for
the exceeding greatness of God's instance, where he reminds the
mighty power, in favour of those Philippians of their future pros-
who believed, which says he is so pects. "We look for the saviour
great, as to resemble the "work- says he, the Lord Jesus Christ,

who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the *working* whereby he is able to subdue all things unto himself." Now "*the exceeding greatness of this power*" is more manifest, more *miraculous* and *amazing* upon the material hypothesis, than upon any other: for according to this doctrine our original powers of perception and consciousness, are recovered by the re-organization of those distinct particles of which our beings were composed, and which will most probably have been sunk down into that depth of corruption, which a thousand ages would create.—That perception should be recovered after having been lost for so long a period—that we should live a second time—that the principles essential to identity should be re-collected, re-organized, and re-vivified, is a view that is admirable for simplicity and greatness! and which makes the Divine power appear far more transcendent, than does that scheme, which supposes that the thinking powers inhere in something distinct from the body—that they are not suspended by death, and that the resurrection is a mere re-union of the percipient with the material part of man: upon this view, not half so much is lost by death, nor half so much is regained by the resurrection as upon the material hypothesis; nor is the display of an Omnipotent power so stupendous upon the former, as upon the latter system. The laboured language of the apostle, is as natural as it is suitable to a complete resurrection, whilst a partial and insignificant one deprives it of its energy and importance.

16th. All our reasonings upon the article of death are naturally favourable to the material hypothesis. There is nothing in the appearance of death that would suggest to us the idea of a separate distinct principle from matter, being the seat of perception; for though the whole man appears to be lifeless, yet every part of the body, even that which we term the seat of intellect, may continue undetached: nothing seems to be wanting, but the respiration of the lungs, and the consequent circulation of the blood; these we should naturally be led to think, would make the man to live again. The resemblance of death throughout the whole of the animated creation is in favour of simple materiality: every living thing in the present world is subject to death: life seems to depend upon the same principles, and may be taken away by the same means. "In the blood is the life," was the reason assigned to the Israelites for their not eating blood, and which they were forbidden to do by a Divine prohibition.

Again, the perception of the senses, must be the same in many animals with that of man, and the loss of this perception, either partially or totally, must be attended with corresponding effects. Further, consider death in the universality of the term, i. e. consider it in relation to the general classes of intelligent being. This consideration being most general, will perhaps afford us the most correct idea of death. Now in giving a definition of this article, I would define the death of an animal, the death of a man, the death of an angel, and the death of the Deity himself, were

he passive, in such a manner, as would correspond with all these real or supposed subjects. The separation of two distinct substances, such as body and soul are represented to be, is not avowedly professed with respect to animals, by immaterialists themselves; and as to angels, there are no writings or Christians that maintain them to be a compounded order of beings: the immaterialist represents them as being pure and exalted spirits, and the materialist considers them as beings whose perception inheres in one substance, consist in whatever it may. Dying, with them, must therefore mean something different to a separation of substances, because they have but one substance; and with respect to the Deity, who is essentially immortal, and of whom we say he cannot die, what is the specific idea which we preclude, i. e. what idea have we of that state to which His immortality stands opposed? The supposed separation of body and spirit will not relieve us from the difficulty! since his essence is *whole and indivisible*: nothing less therefore than a dissolution of his attributes—a ceasing to exist in any conscious state of being—is intended as an opposite to his unbounded immortality. These observations with respect to three of these particular subjects, lay a foundation for a very important question concerning the fourth, viz. *man*: If the death of an animal, the death of an angel, and the death of the Deity, consist in a loss of consciousness, why should the death of an human being be an exception? if death be a different state in this latter case, to any of the former, it should also have a different name! but the fact is, that death upon the material hypothesis is a term uniform in its meaning, whilst upon the immaterial system, it is perfectly unintelligible, and admits of no general definition.—Lastly: we may almost infer the unconsciousness of death, from the love of life, as well as from the dread of death. We cling to life, because we imagine, and imagine justly, that we cannot exist without it: we dread the approach of death, because it appears like “a land of darkness, where no light is:” to shut our eyes upon every visible object, for ever! is a thought that would make life itself distressing, and give to death a more than terrific form! but as Christians, our fears are abated, and our hopes are revived, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead.

17th. The moral advantages of this doctrine, deserve to be taken into consideration, and may be justly urged in its favour. The doctrine of simple materiality is calculated to inspire the mind with humility. When we reflect upon the *dust* as being our origin; when we contemplate ourselves as an heap of animated clay; we feel ourselves more upon a level with things around us than we should do with a fancied immateriality: those pompous sayings which express our celestial origin, our natural immortality, &c. are calculated to awaken vanity, to beget self-complacency, and in short, to make us “think more highly of ourselves than we ought to think:”—very different effects did the doctrine

we have now been contending for what he could justly withhold, produce upon the ancient patriarchs,—upon Abraham, when he said, “Behold I have taken upon me to speak to the Lord, who am but dust and ashes;” upon David, who said, “Thou knowest whereof we are made: thou rememberest we are but dust:” upon Isaiah, who said, “All flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of the grass;” and upon others; who represent themselves as *having their foundation in the dust, and as being crushed before the moth*.—This doctrine is best calculated to inspire the Christian’s mind with gratitude. Contemplating what he is by nature—a *frail and dying mortal*, he feels himself peculiarly indebted to that *good being*, who first gave rise to his existence, for the promise of a resurrection to eternal life by Jesus Christ, which he hath engaged to effect.—The sentiment of his heart exactly corresponds with that of the apostle Peter’s, who introduces his first epistle by saying,—“Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his abundant mercy, hath begotten us again unto a lively hope (*the hope of living again*) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead:” or with St. Paul, who closes his admirable chapter on the resurrection of the dead, with devout exultation: “Thanks be unto God who giveth us the victory,” (*viz. over death and the grave*) “through our Lord Jesus Christ.” The Divine Being shews us by death, that he can deprive us of existence if he please;—*that what he first gave he can take away*: and if from his own benignity, he is pleased to restore

we have the most increased cause for gratitude, which heightens with the magnitude of the gift. Further, we urge in favour of the material doctrine, the purity of its tendency, throughout the whole chain of the Christian doctrine. Had the doctrine of the simple materiality of man been uniformly maintained, to it most irrational and absurd creed which asserts, that “as the body and soul make but one man, so God and man make but one Christ,” had never existed; neither could the Romish doctrines of purgatory, of prayers for the dead and to the dead have ever crept into the church:—these errors would have had no root from whence they could have sprung; the wild imaginations of men would have been kept more completely within the bounds of rationality; and in short, most of the principal corruptions of Christianity would have been prevented.

18th. There is a *natural advantage* in this doctrine, which may be justly urged in its favour, and that is, the intimate connexion between the two states, the present and the future. Death, upon the material hypothesis, is an unconscious state; consequently, the intervening period between death and the resurrection however long, is entirely lost in the account. The two percipient states of man, are the present and the future; and the latter, to all appearance, will immediately succeed the former. It was with this view I conceive, that the apostles and the first Christians desired to be “clothed upon,” “with *their* house which was from heaven,” and thus it

was "that mortality" *itself* "was swallowed up of life." It was under this impression, viz. that of associating the future state with the present, that they were led so uniformly to represent "the day of the Lord" as being "nigh at hand;" and as desiring "to depart and to be with Christ." The date of the immortal inheritance upon this hypothesis, commences at the close of the mortal; so that departed Christians are sometimes represented as those who "inherit the promises."

Lastly. The doctrine of simple materialism, has been countenanced and supported by the most eminent Christian philosophers. The great Mr. Locke, who considered *matter* as possessing some solid properties, did nevertheless admit the possibility of its being rendered perceptible. The solidity of matter has usually been considered by immaterialists as an argument which at once demonstrates the absurdity of Mr. Locke's concession: they of course, in their attempts to define spirit and to distinguish it from matter, have divested it of every property in common with it: but how two such heterogeneous substances can act upon each other, is a circumstance, altogether inexplicable;

whilst on the other hand, the difficulties arising from the hypothesis of matter being made the subject of thought, have been wholly removed, by that first of Christian philosophers, the late Rev. Dr. Priestley. The doctor, in his *Disquisitions*, has introduced a large field of reasoning blended with just observation upon these subjects. He has proved the immaterial doctrine to be of pagan origin, though like every other doctrine, which is the offspring of the imagination, it has undergone various changes and refinements,—the French unbelievers have the credit of refining it the most effectually! Dr. Priestley has demonstrated by argument and experiment, the insolidity and penetrability of *matter*; by these means, he has removed a "stone of stumbling" out of the way of the immaterialists, and has done much in aid of the scriptural philosophy of man. The suffrage of such a man as the Dr. in favour of simple materialism, will certainly have its weight with the reasoning class of Christians; and as to those who decry *reason*, we cannot expect that they will ever make any proper use of it.

Leicester.

STEVESUS.

ANSWERS TO THE INQUIRER.

Nov. 3, 1808. Whig," that belonged to the late M. Repos. vol. iii. p. 559. Mr. Town-end; but in the Biog. The sermon alluded to, on Prov. Brit. it is said generally in the xiv. 24. was probably, by the article "Chandler," that the doctor wrote "about fifty papers in of Moreton and Halingbury, in that work." The whole consists Essex; published 1773. P. 559. of only pp. 103. Nos. 33 and I have not the copy of "the Old 39, were written by Mr. Jackson

of Leicester, and No. 63, by Disney, then vicar of Swinder.
Dr. Caleb Fleming. by, lately minister of Essex cha-

P. 531. the writer of the "Re- pel, and now of the Hyde in
marks on Bishop Hurd's Charge, Essex.
in 1777," was the Rev. Dr. A. B.

CHARACTER OF THE "OLD WHIG."

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

Near Bradford, Yorkshire, er importance; and although
SIR, Nov. 5, 1808. some of your readers may unex-

I wish very much to see in some expectedly be so fortunate as to
future number of your valuable gratify the very laudable curiosity
Repository, an answer to the que- of T. yet if as is most probable,
ries of your correspondent T. the event should turn out other-
p. 559, as to the papers which wise, I earnestly hope this rather
were written by the late Dr. Chand- untoward circumstance will not
ler in the "Old Whig." I also prevent them from bestowing a
am equally anxious to know who speedy and attentive perusal on
were the writers of the other pa- these truly valuable papers. They
pers in that excellent miscellany. will assuredly reap equal pleasure
It is well known they were chiefly and information; and perhaps too
the productions of young dissent- may be disposed to join with me
ing ministers; and it is equally in regretting that such an interest-
certain that they do great honour ing collection of papers should
to the writers: as however, ma- remain so long in obscurity.
ny similar queries with these now
proposed by T. have already ap- Our countrymen are now very
peared in other periodical works zealous in assisting the people of
without success, it may be justly *Spain* and *Portugal*, in asserting
feared they will now again meet and obtaining their rights. It
with the same fate. But certain- may therefore be asserted that
ly these volumes deserve the pe- we cannot well render these peo-
rusal of your readers, as contain- ple a more important service than
ing a masterly explication and by supplying them with transla-
defence of the grand principles tions of our best writers in the
of civil and religious liberty. cause of civil and religious liber-
The names of writers who could ty, to assist them in forming a
so ably, and in such a manly, ani- more rational system of govern-
mating manner explain and de- ment. If these foreigners, now
fend the glorious cause in which fashionably dignified with the ap-
they were so honourably engaged pellation of PATRIOTS, are to be
are always worth preserving; but enlightened, it must be with the
the *spirit* and good sense with above light from *our free country*:
which they wrote, is of far great- for certainly they will have spent
their treasure and blood to little

purpose, if they after all, content themselves with absolute monarchy for their civil government and intolerant POPERY for their established religion. Your's,
T. H.

MR. MARSON'S DEFENCE OF THE PRE-EXISTENCE OF CHRIST,
IN REPLY TO MR. BELSHAM. LETTER IV.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

SIR, Sep. 26, 1808. 22." The glory he prayed for
I proceed in reply to Mr. Belsham, to another passage in support of the doctrine of the pre-existence of Jesus Christ. i. e. John xvii. 5. *And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine ownself, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.* In this passage, there are several things worthy of notice: first, that our Lord speaks of a glory which he says he had before the world was, and which he had with the Father; secondly, that he was not then in the possession of it, for that is the object for which he prays; and thirdly, that the answer of his prayer would be the reinstating him in the possession of a glory which he had before enjoyed. Now it is almost impossible to conceive of any terms by which the fact of his pre-existence could be more fully ascertained, than by those here used; and it surely will require great critical skill, to explain the words so as to set aside that idea. Mr. Belsham, however, endeavours to prove that our Lord's words have no such meaning. First, he says*, "that for which our Lord here *prays*, is the very same which he *proposed* to communicate to his disciples. See verse 26. 1 Thes. iv. 17. That this is the glory which the Father had given him, and which he had given to his disciples is clear from verse 24. *Father, I will that they also whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory which thou hast given me.* This then is that glory for which he prays, and of which he says, that he had it with the Father before the world was. Mr. Belsham adds†, "this glory was unquestionably the glory of publishing the gospel to the world." I answer that most unquestionably it was not; because that glory he was then in the possession of, and had been in the possession of from the commencement of his ministry, and there-

* M. Repos. vol. ii. p. 550.

† Ibid.

fore could not pray for it. We may apply the reasoning of Paul respecting hope to this subject, and say, "what a man seeth, that is, what he is in possession of, why doth he yet pray for?"

To prove that this glory was unquestionably the glory of publishing the gospel, Mr. Belsham refers to verse 8, 14, and adds*, "they were his messengers to mankind, as he had been his Father's messenger, v. 18." In the former of these verses, our Lord says, "I have given unto them the words (not the glory) which thou gavest me." In the 14th verse the same thing is repeated, but there is not any thing said about giving them a glory. In the 18th verse, our Lord says to his Father, "as thou hast sent me into the world; so have I sent them into the world." Or as Mr. Belsham has it, "They were his messengers to mankind, as he had been his Father's messenger." Very true; but what has this to do with the subject? He had been his Father's messenger, the words which he spake, were the words which his father had given him, he had published the gospel to the world, and now when he had just finished the work which his father had given him to do, did he pray that he might be sent to do it over again? For this, Mr. Belsham says, was unquestionably the glory for which he prayed.

The comparison in the 18th verse, between the mission of Jesus Christ and that of his disciples, is frequently adduced as an argument against his pre-existence; but that argument is without any real foundation in the

passage, because the comparison is only a partial one, or in other words their mission is compared with the mission of Jesus with respect to one part of it only, that is, *his being sent into the world*: whereas the mission of Jesus, as we have seen in a former letter on chap. xvi. 28. consisted of two parts, his coming forth from the Father, as well as his coming into the world. Now in the latter sense only, is the mission of Jesus and that of his apostles compared. He does not say that as he *came forth from the Father*, and was his messenger to mankind, so they also came forth from the Father, and were sent by him into the world. He might therefore say, that as the father had sent him into the world, so he had sent them into the world consistently with his having come down from heaven.

Secondly, Mr. Belsham says, that Jesus had this glory before the world was, not really, but only in the purpose of God; an assertion utterly destitute of support from the Scriptures.

His *prayer*, says Mr. Belsham†, was that he might be "honoured as the instrument of instructing mankind in truth and goodness, and in making them virtuous and happy; and he was desirous that his apostles might share with him in his honour and felicity." A prayer which might have had some propriety in it, if addressed to his Father before he entered on his ministry, but is utterly unaccountable if addressed to him at the close of it.

"This glory," he adds, "he had given them, that is, it was

* M. Repos. vol. ii. p. 550.

† Ibid.

his firm *purpose* and *intention* to give it to them. For they were not actually qualified and sent forth till after the effusion of the spirit on the day of pentecost. In the same sense the Father *had* given it to him, that is, had fully *purposed* to bestow it upon him, for he was not yet in possession of it, nor had he yet *altogether* finished the work assigned him, the scene of his sufferings not being yet begun, though he expresses himself strongly in the past tense, "I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do," where he could mean nothing more than to express the absolute certainty of the event."

On this most extraordinary passage it will be necessary to make several observations. First, Mr. Belsham represents the publication of the gospel by Jesus Christ as not having commenced, when he uttered this prayer; for he says, "he was not yet in the possession of that glory," but that now, at the close of his ministry *he prays that it might be bestowed upon him*, that "*He might be the honoured instrument of instructing mankind in truth and goodness, and in making them virtuous and happy.*" I would ask Mr. Belsham, was this prayer of our Lord ever answered? If it was, when was the glory of publishing the gospel conferred upon him, and when did he enter upon the honourable work of instructing mankind, this prayer being addressed to his Father just before his entering upon those sufferings which terminated in his death. Secondly, Mr. Belsham asserts that Jesus Christ *had not yet altogether finished the work assigned him*. On the contrary,

Jesus Christ positively asserts that he had. If the work assigned him, was the work of publishing the gospel and instructing mankind, as it certainly was; Mr. Belsham needed not to have introduced the qualifying term *altogether*, for according to him he had not yet so much as entered upon it, much less finished it. In proof that he had not altogether finished the work assigned him, Mr. Belsham, alleges that "the scene of his sufferings was not yet begun," and that therefore when our Lord said, "I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do, he could mean nothing more than to express the absolute certainty of the event."

It may be asked, were the *sufferings* of Christ any part of the *work assigned him*? are they ever called, or would it be proper to call them *his work*? Did he *infect* those sufferings upon himself? It is said "He was put to death;" was his death then his own act or that of his enemies? He would, had it been possible, have been relieved from them, but he *submitted*, saying "not my will but thine be done." How then does "the scene of his sufferings not being begun" prove that, when he said, "I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do," he could mean nothing more than to express the absolute certainty of the event? Thirdly, Mr. Belsham says, that "Jesus was desirous that his apostles might share with him in this honour and felicity," as the instruments of instructing mankind. "This glory," he says, "he *had* given them, that is, it was his firm *purpose* and *intention* to give it them." This glory, he says, was *unquestionably*

the glory of publishing the gospel, this glory Jesus Christ says he *had* given his disciples. Upon what ground then does Mr. Belsham affirm that he had not given it them, but only *purposed* and intended to do it? Did Jesus not mean what his words seemed to import; but something very different from it, if not the very reverse of it? But that Jesus Christ really meant what he said and not what Mr. Belsham supposes him to mean, is sufficiently clear from what is recorded by the evangelists. Mark says * that, in the earlier part of his ministry, "He (Jesus) ordained twelve," i. e. of his disciples, "that they should be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach, and to have power to heal sicknesses and to cast out demons." See also Mat. x. 1. and Luke vi. 13. Surely Mr. Belsham will not say that when he ordained them, named them apostles, as Luke tells us he did, endued them with miraculous powers and sent them forth to preach, that he did not actually bestow on them the glory of publishing the gospel, but only intended to do it. Or will he say in the face of the passages above referred to, that they were not qualified for the business to which they were appointed? But he says, "they were not *actually* qualified and sent forth till after the effusion of the spirit on the day of pentecost." That they received additional qualifications at that time is true, but that they were apostles before, and were actually qualified to instruct mankind though in a less degree, is equally true, and consequently

Jesus Christ had actually and not intentionally given them the glory which his father had given him.

"In the same sense," says Mr. Belsham, "the Father *had* given it (this glory) to him, that is, had fully purposed to bestow it upon him." Jesus Christ says that the glory which he prayed for, he *had* with the Father before the world was; Mr. Belsham says he *had* it *in the purpose* of God, that is, God had *fully purposed* to give it him. That God does all things *according* to his purpose, and that men are called and have blessings bestowed upon them *according* to the purpose of God is language that is intelligible, is the language of scripture; but that God has *done* any thing, or *given* any thing *in purpose*; or that we *have* or *possess* any thing in the *purpose* of God is neither the language of scripture, nor of common sense, and therefore I conclude not the meaning of our Lord in those words, "The glory which I *had* with thee before the world was."

Mr. Belsham says †, "This way of speaking of a thing as already done, which was certainly determined upon, was familiar to the Jews;" but he has not cited one passage from the *Jewish* scriptures to prove it, and those passages which he has cited from the Christian scriptures, are some of them cited from epistles written to Gentile churches, and not one of them say any thing like what they are brought to prove. Let us examine the passages. 2 Tim. i. 9. "Who hath saved us and called us with an holy calling,

* Chap. iii. 14.

† M. Repos. Vol. ii. p. 550.

not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace which was given in us in Christ, before the world began." The apostle does not say that God had saved them and called them in his purpose; but according to his own purpose, and that grace was given to them, not in the purpose of God, but in Christ, before the world began. Ephes. i. 4. "According as he hath chosen us," not in his purpose, but unfortunately for Mr. Belsham's system, the passage expressly says, "in Christ before the foundation of the world." Now this is all very natural upon the supposition of the pre-existence of Jesus Christ, but appears to have no meaning without it. The promise of eternal life, is the promise that God promised; (not in purpose, for a promise in purpose has no meaning, but) in Christ before the world began, and in that promise eternal life was given to mankind in Jesus Christ. Where there is a grant there must be a grantee. A grant may be made and an inheritance given to the future unborn posterity of a person, but such a grant necessarily supposes the existence of the person in and through whom it is made. These passages then instead of furnishing any argument against the pre-existence of Jesus Christ, by strong implication at least establish it. Heb. x. 34. "Knowing in yourselves that ye have in heaven a better and enduring substance." Here again it is not said that they had this in the purpose of God, but in heaven; they had it, i. e. they had a right to it, by the promise of God, and it was reserved for them in heaven. A gift by promise is

a real gift, (see Gal. iii. 18.) whereas a gift in purpose is no gift at all. The last passage referred to, is Rom. viii. 29, 30. It might be sufficient to say that there is not a word in this passage about the purpose of God: in the preceding verse, the apostle says, "all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called, (not in, but) according to his purpose." It would be strange then to suppose that in the very next words he uses the term called, &c. in a very different sense, without giving any intimation that he does so, especially as the words are an inference drawn from the preceding verse. The reasoning of the apostle in these verses makes it necessary I conceive, to understand him as speaking of the calling, justification and glorification of the persons referred to, as real and not in the purpose of God. The mistaken idea that the word glorified refers to the future glorification of believers, and that the apostle, by the word predestinated, means a predestination to that glory from the beginning, is what I apprehend has led to a false interpretation of the passage. Mr. Belsham's interpretation, would naturally lead us into the very depths of calvinism. For, if the divine fore-knowledge has made a discrimination of certain individuals from eternity, (and the phrase, "whom he did fore-know," is the very language of discrimination; had Mr. Belsham sufficiently attended to this circumstance, I am persuaded he would have discovered a meaning in the apostle's words very different from that which he has put upon them); if I say the divine

fore-knowledge, has made a discrimination from eternity of certain individuals, and if God has glorified those individuals in his eternal purpose, or absolutely predestinated them to glory, then was their glorification eternally fixed by an absolute decree, and the doctrine of eternal election is completely established. On the other hand, those who were not the objects of the divine fore-knowledge, consequently were not the objects of predestination to glory, and thus also the doctrine of eternal reprobation will be as fully established. Enough, I conceive, has been said on these passages to shew that there is nothing in them to prove, what they are brought to prove, that is, that when our Lord says that the glory which he prayed for, he *had* before the world was, he only means that he *had* it in the *purpose* of God and not actually in possession.

In this prayer, our Lord not only says, "and now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was;" but he also says, "Father, I will, that they also whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am, that they may behold my glory which thou hast given me: for thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world." The glory here prayed for was a future glory, this glory his Father *had* given him, for he had it with him before the world was, his disciples had been *with him* from the beginning, they had seen him in the exercise of publishing the gospel, and instructing mankind, they had heard his discourse and seen his miracles; and yet he now

prays that they *might be with him where he was*, that they might behold the glory which his Father *had* given him. This glory therefore could not be, as Mr. Belsham affirms it to be, the glory of publishing the gospel. Our Lord adds, as the reason of this request, or as a proof of his Father's having giving him this glory, that he *loved him before the foundation of the world*. Now I believe God is never said to love any being prior to that being having any existence. The case of Jacob and Esau, cited by the apostle in the ninth chapter to the Romans, is no proof of it, for that passage has no reference to Jacob and Esau personally, but to their posterity: the words, "Jacob have I loved, and Esau have I hated," were not said of them before they were born; they are cited from the last of the Jewish prophets, and the causes of that love and hatred are distinctly mentioned.

Will Mr. Belsham say that God loved Jesus Christ *in purpose* or that he *purposed* to love him before the foundation of the world? I confess I am quite at a loss to understand the terms. Will he then explain what a *purpose to love* means, or with what propriety a person can be said to *love in purpose*: we may then perhaps be able to understand how Christ *had* the glory he prayed for, in the *purpose of God*, before the world was. Has our Lord any where said that his Father *loved* his disciples *before the foundation of the world*, or that they *had* a glory with him *before the world was*? If all this was in *purpose* only, it was as true of them as it was of him, and the

language is as applicable to them as it was to him, and yet he uniformly speaks thus exclusively respecting himself. To what is this to be attributed, but to the fact that he had pre-existed and they had not, and therefore such language was proper with respect to him, but was not so with respect to them.

With these remarks I shall close my defence of the doctrine of pre-existence of Jesus Christ, from the Gospel of John, and in my next (which I mean to be my last*) I shall advert, in support of it, to a passage or two in the Epistles of Paul.

Your's, &c.

JOHN MARSON.

IMMACULATE CONCEPTION, THE TEST OF A "SPANISH PATRIOT."

SIR, Nov. 12, 1808.
Your correspondent (p. 550.) correcting a passage in the "Christian's Survey," has fallen into an error himself. That dogma, a *sine qua non* in the qualifications of "a Spanish Patriot," is not the *miraculous*, but the *immaculate* conception of the virgin, or a belief that she was conceived by her mother without the stain of original sin, *sine vitio et labe*, as A. N. quotes from Mosheim, yet not as appears, out of the course of ordinary generation. Your readers who have any curiosity on the subject may refer to Mosheim's Ecc. Hist. Cent. xii. p. 2. ch. 3. and Cent. xvii. S. 2.

p. 1. This test, imposed by the Junta, sufficiently shews the influence which governs the "Spanish Patriots." Spain indeed, appears to be in this sad dilemma: either to bend under the power of a military despot who, with true policy, breaks every other yoke in imposing his own, or to become *externally* free while she remains the prey of her own crafty priests and cruel inquisitors. A humane and enlightened politician, and still more a Christian, can scarcely allow himself to be any thing but the *spectator* of such a scene.

CORRECTOR.

JOHN LACY'S PROPHECY.

SIR, Woburn, October 17, 1808.
I object to the opinion of your correspondent P. Q. (p. 467.) respecting "the spirit of prophecy" being still appointed, as a means of convincing man of the divine agency," and in defence of which he brings forward the prophecy of John Lacy, upon three distinct

grounds.—First, because the works of nature sufficiently demonstrate "the divine agency," without the assistance of any prophecy whatever; secondly, because a prophecy which was promulgated "a century before-hand" (even supposing it to be founded in truth.) could be but of little service in this respect,

* Mr. Marson's final Letter will appear in the SUPPLEMENTARY NUMBER. Ed.

to those who existed previous to the time of its supposed accomplishment; and thirdly, because the language of John Lacy's prophecy is so completely *Billingsgate*, as to render it almost blasphemous to suppose that it could have been dictated by the spirit of the Almighty.

I am, Sir,

Your's, &c.

VERITAS.

ANSWERS TO THE "CHURCHMAN'S" REPLY, BY AN UNITARIAN
AND MR. ALLCHIN.

For the sake of bringing both the following Letters into the present No. we are obliged to print them in a small type. It is desirable, as we have before stated, that the controversy provoked by the Churchman should be laid to rest in the present volume. The *Supplement* will afford room for any further brief communications.

EDITOR.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

SIR,

Having been an attentive observer of the discussion between the Churchman and his Unitarian opponents, and having intended, had I not been too late, to have made a few observations upon his first letter, I will by your indulgence now do it and incorporate into it such additional ones as his reply has suggested to me. I am induced to do this from a persuasion, that his letter is calculated to do some mischief to young persons, and to all those who have made but a slight or superficial enquiry into the subject, hoping at the same time to furnish a justification to some Unitarians at least, for calling themselves "Rational Christians."

Notwithstanding the defence which the Churchman makes, in his reply to Mr. Belsham, of writing under an anonymous signature, I cannot help thinking it very disingenuous to write under one, to which, if I am not much mistaken, he has no title; for whatever he may think of Unitarians in other respects, I assure him they are not so stupid, as not easily to discover under his pretended character of a Churchman attacking Unitarians, a real unbeliever assailing the evidences of Christianity:

and it appears from his reply to a Unitarian Christian, that he ought to have levelled his attack against Christians for believing the scriptures at all, for he has no objection to our believing in the Divine unity; it would therefore have been fairer and better understood, to have first openly avowed that Unitarians were irrational for believing in the Christian scriptures on such evidence, and then having believed in them, to connect with them a belief of the doctrines of necessity and materialism.

The plain question stripped of all disguise between your correspondent and Unitarians then is, are they rational in believing in the Christian revelation upon the evidences afforded them? He says they are not; for denying their inspiration, they yet acknowledge them as fully equal to complete instruction in religion upon evidence not satisfactory, for "it is very unreasonable" says he "to believe, that plain men, such as the apostles, could be sufficiently accurate for our purpose," in their account of what they saw and heard at such a distance of time; "could this be expected from the rude fishermen in question? and when was this conversation, and when were these discourses committed to writing and by whom? History is silent! When were the books written and by whom, that we now have in the names of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John? Discard then the notion of inspiration and they are left without a known author and we have to repose our confidence in the powers of observation, memory, and judgment of we know not whom?" This appears to contain the full force of your correspondent's argument; and if we can satisfactorily answer this, all else he has advanced must fall to the ground; because Unitarians as a body are not concerned in any of his other objections.—To this I would

briefly reply there are no facts or doctrines believed by Unitarian Christians that can be invalidated by any mere inaccuracy in the relation of either or any of the Evangelists, because the facts and doctrines they believe are established by an *accumulation of evidence*. In the first place, Christianity would stand upon strong *presumptive evidence* from the present state of Europe in connexion with profane history, were there no Christian scriptures extant; in the next place I trust I shall be able to shew, there are some of those books sufficiently authentic for our purpose, were it possible that all the others could be proved of doubtful authority or even forgeries.

It has been forcibly observed by Paley, "that a Jewish peasant has changed the religion of the world." In examining by what instrumentality this great change was effected, he finds that one Paul of Tarsus is said to have been one of the first and most distinguished agents, that there are several letters written by him to the several churches he had planted in the Lesser Asia, Macedonia, Achaia, now preserved, in which the great facts of the Christian revelation are clearly stated or referred to in some other document.—In examining these letters in his *Horæ Paulinæ*, he has proved their authenticity by a train of sound criticism, he has made each to prove the genuineness of the others and all to prove the truth of another document received by Christians, entitled the Acts of the Apostles, by such a variety of undesigned coincidences, that if this evidence, added to the general historical argument be not satisfactory, I should conclude there can be obtained no satisfactory proof for any historical fact. It follows if this memoir be true, that the gospel by Luke must be (in the main) true also, because it was written by the same person, and is in fact only the former part of the same history. I do not mean to assert that the books to which I have here referred, are free from all errors or such additions and interpolations as all other ancient books were liable to, but I do contend that all the principal facts, believed by us as Unitarian Christians, are sufficiently authenticated, and if unaccompanied by any other evidence I should not deem it irrational to believe them. It is not necessary for my purpose to notice any of the other books against which your correspondent may object; were there no existing proof of the au-

thenticity of any one of them, the books to which I have referred, would afford sufficient ground for a rational belief in the Christian revelation.

But Unitarians as well as others have another additional species of evidence of no small importance, I mean the internal; in the above epistles and history, we find inculcated in every page some branch of a system of the purest morality, calculated to make all who practice it better and happier. I trust this will not be brought to prove that Unitarians have therefore no claim to the title of "Rational Christians."

But your correspondent objects, "that should these historical records be even as good as those of Livy or Tacitus it would not avail us, because the divine records are of vital consequence to us, and if given by a benevolent God for our essential benefit, they must be attended by very different evidence." This argument I acknowledge to have great weight, and if unanswerable would prove more in his favour than all the others he has produced.—But thanks be to God in the scheme of the Christian revelation, he has vouchsafed to afford us *super-human* evidence in its support, and of such a species as your correspondent seems to demand, and this will be found in *completed prophecy*.—The Christian dispensation was clearly predicted in the Jewish scriptures. Even Moses foretold that a prophet like unto himself would be raised up, and it appears from Acts iv. 4. that when Peter, preaching to the Jews referred to this passage, although being in Jerusalem, where they must have heard of, if not seen the miracles wrought by Jesus, it was on this evidence of completed prophecy that so great a multitude were converted to Christianity. Many of the Jewish and Christian prophets have also predicted the rise, progress, and final consummation of the whole Christian dispensation; and this being beyond the reach of human sagacity or contrivance, evidently proves its divine source, becoming to every serious and attentive student of the prophecies, the same species of evidence in every age that miracles were to the eye-witnesses in the days of the apostles, and with this additional important consideration that it strengthens with the lapse of time, as history displays the accomplishment of a continual series of fresh events, and to us of the present day, there is from every

appearance around us a regular succession of them, tending in due time to a full and final accomplishment of the whole Christian dispensation.

Here sir, I should have concluded, having replied to the only point that Unitarians were fairly called upon to defend; but the Churchman in his reply, says (and he quotes the authority of Dr. Priestley,) that he considers Unitarianism as connected with a species of philosophy, or it is nothing; and he states the inconsistency of Unitarians in believing the scriptures in connexion with necessity and materialism. These philosophical speculations are certainly not generally believed by Unitarians, nor is it fair to charge them as a body with the speculations of one or two individuals however respectable; but suppose the whole body should plead guilty to the charge, let us examine to what it will amount.—The doctrine of necessity is founded on a fact that I presume your correspondent will scarce venture to deny, viz. that there is no effect without a cause, for on this fact depends the proper and most satisfactory evidence for the being of a God as distinct from his works, possessing power to controul them; to deny this leads to pure Atheism; and as it can be only to the consequences of the doctrine of necessity, to which his objection can lie, we will if he pleases briefly examine these.—The Necessarian believes that there is but one governing Will in the universe, and that is God; habitually referring to his appointment in all the events of life, he sees God in every thing; and contemplating his perfections of power, wisdom and goodness, as manifested in the works of creation, his mind is elevated to the purest and most reverential devotion; and when in connexion with these, his thoughts are turned inwardly on himself, and he considers his own imperfections, he is penetrated with the deepest humility: those sentiments will generate all the benevolent affections, till the Necessarian feels himself with devotion to God and good will to man, animated to the discharge of every social duty; cultivating these dispositions, his mind is constantly approaching towards a more perfect and fixed habit of serenity, devotion and benevolence; when he enters into the busy scenes of life, with a cheerful mind it teaches him to exercise integrity, moderation and candour, in all his intercourse with

the world, and when he retreats into the privacy of retirement, with a serene and dignified composure of mind, his habitual contemplations afford him the most exalted and purest pleasure of which his nature is capable, and should he even recollect the reproaches of your correspondent, the shafts of his ridicule will fall harmless at his feet, and if he feel his principles, he will only utter a devout wish, that even he also were a Necessarian. These are the genuine consequences of the doctrine, and if the Unitarian Christian should superadd it to his creed, I cannot discover how it would deprive him of a claim to the title of a *Rational Christian*.

But he further says, that Unitarians assert, that human actions are all under the law of necessity, and yet subject men hereafter to punishment; and this he terms a further proof of the unreasonableness of their creed. My acquaintance with Unitarians is pretty extensive, and I am a member of a large Unitarian society. We read and explain the scriptures every one for himself according to his own understanding and judgment, and all that as a body we believe is in one God, Jehovah; and in the divine mission, death and resurrection of the man Christ Jesus; creeds and articles of faith, we neither impose upon others nor subscribe to ourselves; we leave the exclusive privilege of this absurdity, to your correspondent's and all other divisions of the orthodox apostate church, whose creeds and articles are composed in a jargon of unintelligible and incomprehensible terms, that neither teachers nor learners ever did or ever can understand. But as a sect, he says, they believe that though human actions are under the law of necessity, yet that men will be hereafter subjected to PUNISHMENT. If by *punishment* he means *torment*, I as an individual do not believe it, because I am persuaded the Christian scriptures teach no such doctrine.

But the better to fasten reproach upon Unitarians, he gives them the more obnoxious title of materialists, but on what ground I don't know. In the discussion of this harmless speculation, he cannot be ignorant, that from want of defining their terms, the disputants have generally made it a war about words; it therefore behoved him when he exhibited this charge, to say what a materialist is; as to myself although in my own sense of the word I am a materialist, I

pretend to know nothing of matter but its properties; but whenever your correspondent shall condescend to explain to me its essence, should I find it to prove that materialists are irrational Christians, I will make a speedy concession; but as I suspect he will not do this very soon, and as I am growing rather old, I shall not again most probably Mr. Editor, have to trouble you by occupying your valuable pages on this subject.

Whatever have been the motives with your correspondent for this attack, he has certainly displayed considerable talents and an acute mind, though apparently so tinctured with scepticism, as must I fear in those moments of retirement that ought to be the happy-t of his life, rob him of its best consolations. I would therefore seriously advise him to re-consider the evidence for the truth of Christianity, as I conclude he neither from education or abilities wants the means; and if any thing in the train of evi-

dence I have so briefly stated above, should strike his mind, and lead him by a fresh examination to a conviction of the truth of Christianity, so strongly am I persuaded that it will tend to the promotion of his happiness and best interests, that to know it would afford me sincere pleasure. I would once more appeal to him as a man of calculation, (for such I think he must be) and request him to consider that should Christianity even prove a fiction and the doctrine of Necessity be unfounded, the Necessarian Christian has learnt the art of extracting the sting, or lessening the pressure of all the calamities of life, and smoothing his passage through it, and when that solemn hour shall arrive to which they are both hastening, he is upon a footing with the unbeliever; but if Christianity be true, to him it is of vital consequence.

I am, &c.

AN UNITARIAN.

MR. ALLCHIN'S ANSWER, TO THE CHURCHMAN'S REPLY.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

SIR, Maidstone, Nov. 15, 1808.

With respect to the question between "a Churchman" and myself, relative to the reasonableness of Unitarianism, as it appears to me of the greatest imaginable importance, I am happy to find that he has replied to my remarks on his first letter. I thank him for his politeness, but as it is my wish to come to a speedy issue, to that point only my attention shall be directed.

The importance of the controversy between us is evident to me, from this consideration, that no other denomination of Christians make any pretensions to rationality. I do not mean that they will not defend their sentiments by reason, but they refuse to submit them to its scrutiny abstracted from their evidence. It seems therefore a perfectly legitimate inference, that if Unitarianism be not rational, every individual mode under which Christianity has hitherto been professed is truly absurd, and I can by no means admit that what is evidently absurd can possibly be true.

Your correspondent however professes to be of a different opinion. He "thinks

that much of religious speculation may be true, which appears not consistent with human reasoning." But what other reasoning can be exercised by human beings? Or how are we to distinguish between what only appears to be inconsistent with reason, and what is so in reality? Or what other means have we of distinguishing truth from falsehood, than the proper exercise of our reasoning faculties? Or why should we apprehend that we are under an eternal necessity of being deluded in points of the highest importance to our welfare, whatever pains we may take to investigate the subject?—However, I readily admit that it is but fair, to examine distinctly the claim of rationality, advanced by Unitarians; and this shall be my object as well as a "A Churchman's."

But it is sufficiently obvious that no system of theology, however consistent in itself, can justly be considered as rational, if its evidence be defective. "A Churchman" therefore directs his principal force against this main bulwark both of Unitarianism and of orthodoxy. He however, does not state the objec-

tions as his own, (for some of them would be inconsistent with his character as "A Churchman") but as proposed by "*the advocacy of this deduction from testimony merely human.*" Very good. The objections are of equal weight proceed from whom they may; and remain to be considered.

He greatly mistakes my meaning, when he conceives me to admit that the genuineness of the books which constitute the New Testament "is impossible to be proved." In his first letter he contended, that the historians of Jesus, if uninspired, were inadequate to the task of writing an account of him, because they were unlearned, and therefore incapable "of storing a discourse in their minds and reporting it with accuracy and precision." In reply, I argued that their minds were so fully occupied, with what they saw and heard relative to their master, that they could not easily forget any thing of importance; that probably, the discourses of Jesus, or the substance of them was committed to writing at a very early period, that the accounts which are now received, might be compiled from such memorandums; and that the beginning of Luke's Gospel seems to countenance such an idea. If this were the case, at least Matthew, John and Peter, the supposed dictator of Mark's Gospel, would be able to judge of their correctness. Supposing this to have been the fact, which I do not affirm, nor consider as essential to my argument, we know not by whom those original documents or memorandums were composed. This is all I have admitted.

In what age since the commencement of the Christian æra has Christianity been free from the attacks of its enemies? Yet when was it ever denied that the Gospel called Matthew's was written by him? or that the book called the Acts of the Apostles was written by Luke? Some additions or alterations may possibly have occurred in the numerous transcripts that were taken from the originals, but do not all the manuscripts which have been examined by the learned, concur in the accounts of the doctrines and miracles of Christ and his disciples? and if so, when they have been universally received and acknowledged by Christians who have constantly appealed to them as the standard of their faith and practice, may not their genuineness be considered as sufficiently

established by the testimony of friends and the concession of enemies? in short by universal consent? What greater evidence can we expect or desire in favour of any ancient book that challenges our assent?

Besides, these books contain such an account of the origin of Christianity as may satisfy the reflecting mind, respecting the cause of its very extraordinary success. For surely it must be considered as *extraordinary* that a few obscure and illiterate men, should be able to establish a new religion on the ruins of every preceding one; and this in opposition to the vigorous efforts of every civil government.

But much it is said may be ascribed to enthusiasm; and unless we possessed more particular information respecting the circumstances, characters and conduct of the first Christians, we cannot say but they might be enthusiasts; or there might even be a mixture of fraud and enthusiasm in their composition. But what ground have we for suspecting the founder of our religion of either? If the received accounts of him be in any degree to be depended upon, he was far remote from both. They represent him as mild, unostentatious and unwearied in doing good; prudent and cautious in his deportment, and though fully aware of the sufferings which awaited him and acutely sensible of their severity, patiently enduring all, rather than the design of his mission should be frustrated. As these accounts of him have always been received by his followers, and as there are no other accounts either of him or of the times in which he lived inconsistent with these, it seems very unreasonable to suspect him of either fraud or enthusiasm, when every information that we can obtain relative to him is an argument of the contrary.

Nearly the same may be said of his immediate followers. If we may rely on the accounts of them which are contained in the New Testament, there is no reason to question either their integrity, or the soundness of their understandings. They were at least capable of perceiving whether or not a man, universally known to have been born blind, was instantaneously restored to sight, without the application of any probable means; or whether a putrified corpse was restored to life by the speaking of a word. There certainly is no

ground from any thing that we know of them to suppose that *any* much less that *all* of them could be so far deluded. As little reason have we to question their integrity. They published the account of their Master's resurrection in the very place where he had been crucified, and reproached his murderers with putting him to death. And when they had been brought before the council, and beaten for the testimony which they had borne, they were not deterred from their undertaking, but rejoiced that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for the name of Christ. Nor does it appear that they aimed at worldly power, authority or emolument.

What I have said of Christ and his immediate disciples, is on the supposition that the accounts of them which have been transmitted to us, are worthy of credit. And why are they not? They relate extraordinary things it is true; but surely nothing that is impossible to the Creator of the universe; nothing that is unworthy of his interposition; and if not, why should they be considered as so utterly incredible that no evidence whatever can establish their truth?

There may indeed be *some* evidence in favour of these books, and yet not sufficient to produce conviction. But if there be any evidence at all of their truth, they are entitled to attention, and if they contain nothing incredible, that evidence remains with undiminished force.

And yet if these narratives be entitled to *any* degree of credit, then it cannot justly be said that "of the first propagators of Christianity, history is silent," as "*the adversary*" affirms. For here we have an account of the founder of that religion and of the principal measures adopted by him and his followers for the dissemination of their doctrines: and their circumstances are at least "so clearly and distinctly" related, as to warrant us in asserting that they could not have been lunatics, and would not have been deceivers.

It ought further to be considered that this is an uncontradicted history; that it is not even inconsistent with any other well attested facts, and that the apparent artlessness and impartiality of the writers, render it by no means probable that the books should have been forged.

Had they not been genuine, how could they ever have been generally received

as such? Were any writer of the present time to forge a continuation of Hume's or of Rapin's history down to a later period; and assert that it was written and published by the original author, and that it was generally received and acknowledged as his, would not every body know to the contrary? And would not the whole body of Christians have known to the contrary, had any one attempted to impose on them a spurious book as the genuine work of an apostle, a hundred or fifty years after his decease?

And though other historians may be silent respecting the rise and progress of the Christian religion, how does this affect its credibility, if they were men who never inquired into the truth of the circumstances which are said to have attended its origin? Was the knowledge of these circumstances to be forced upon their minds whether they would receive it or not? Or if they thought such narratives beneath their attention, how does that invalidate the testimony of those who were eye witnesses, and who sealed that testimony with their blood?

It is true that Paul was neither "an early disciple nor an eye witness of the miracles or ministry of Jesus." It is likewise sufficiently evident that he was by no means pre-disposed to embrace the religion which Jesus taught. So far from this, he was a violent, and yet a conscientious persecutor of Christians. He "verily thought that he ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth." He "breathed out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples," and kept the clothes of those who stoned Stephen to death. Afterwards, when he became a convert, he "laboured more abundantly" than all the apostles, and perhaps suffered more abundantly. He declares that "of the Jews, five times he received forty stripes save one," that he was thrice beaten with rods, and once stoned. He would have received no stripes from the Jews, he would neither have been beaten with rods nor stoned, if he had not professed and preached the Christian faith. What could have occasioned this surprising difference in him? He himself tells, that it was effected by a voice speaking to him from heaven. Had this been all, it might have been a delusion, as it was heard by none but himself; but it was attended by a shining light which was seen likewise by those who were

with him. He was besides struck blind and afterwards miraculously cured by the hands of Ananias. This could not have been the effect of a heated imagination. How can it be accounted for except on the supposition that the miracle was real?

And this supposition not only accounts satisfactorily for the difference in his conduct, but will not appear unreasonable if it be considered that Paul was a zealous, though mistaken religionist before this event; that even when he was a furious persecutor, he meant to perform an acceptable service to his Maker; but that his prejudices against the Christians were so inveterate that nothing short of a palpable miracle could convince him that their profession was true; that there was no miraculous change in his disposition, but only a proper direction given to his zeal; and that there needed nothing else to convert him into a very laborious promoter of the truth. When these circumstances are fairly considered, it will perhaps be admitted by the candid inquirer, not only that the miracle performed for the conversion of Paul, was not "an incredible thing," but that it was worthy of Divine power, and one of the most useful that ever was wrought.

But "Paul was not insensible to the charms of power." Will "A Churchman" permit me to ask if he would have accepted of Paul's pre-eminence, attended with Paul's persecution? or if he thinks any other man would, who enjoyed the right use of his understanding, if he were not firmly convinced and perfectly satisfied in his own mind, that what he taught was true?

What is observed respecting the general circumstances of Jerusalem and of Rome may perhaps be admitted. Many of them might be favourable to imposture, and many impostures no doubt existed. Still this does not prove that there could be no such thing as a revelation free from deceit. It should certainly excite us to make a more careful and more rigid inquiry into the circumstances attending the origin and progress of our religion; but cannot justify us in rejecting it without examination. If its evidence be defective, let it be given up; but not merely because there were some impostors.

Had the Christian religion been founded on deception, it might have been detected and exposed with the

greatest advantage, at the time when, and at the place where, it first originated. And why was it not then detected and exposed? Why was not the lifeless corpse of its founder publicly exhibited after the time, when according to his prediction, he was to rise from the dead? Did his enemies want the will or the power thus to refute his pretensions? We are informed that they set a guard over his sepulchre, and most probably for this very purpose. But what was the result? At the expected time the body was gone. His disciples affirmed that he was risen; and the soldiers declared that he had been stolen away while they were asleep.

But it may be replied, that this is the account given by his own disciples. From whom besides his disciples could we expect such an account admitting it to be true? Who could consistently receive it without becoming his disciple? If it were related as matter of fact by one who notwithstanding did not profess to believe in his religion, should we not reasonably question his sincerity? Whereas if he embraced the religion and thereby exposed himself to severe persecution, his integrity would be evinced beyond all reasonable doubt; and this was precisely the conduct of the first followers of Christ.

Still it may be argued, all this, including the conduct of the first Christians, is related only by Christians. Very true; but it is a clear and consistent account; it is not contradicted by any cotemporary historians; and it must have been a long time before Christianity was sufficiently prosperous to induce any one to forge any thing relative to it; and had an attempt been made to forge an account of its origin, I do not see for reasons stated before, how it could possibly have succeeded.

"No one," we are told, "is persecuted, before he is noticed and distinguished, and it is agreeable to the principles of human action, that men hazard the chance of suffering for the pleasure of distinction." Very few, we may presume, except the wildest enthusiasts, would expose themselves to almost certain sufferings and death, for the sake of being ranked amongst the leaders of a party. And after what kind of distinction can we suppose them to have aspired? Pre-eminence in disgrace; to be the leaders of a sect that was "every where spoken against." Is such a dis-

tion worthy of unremitting labour and severe suffering.

"The saints are promised that they should inherit the earth." In whatever sense this passage of the New Testament ought to be understood, it does not appear that the immediate followers of Christ expected from it any share of worldly riches or honours.

If we refer "to the writings of Paul, the best authenticated of all the scriptural records," we find him appealing to the churches in behalf of his disinterestedness. In his second epistle to the Corinthians, he says, "did I make a gain of you by any of them whom I sent unto you? I desired Titus, and with him I sent a brother. Did Titus make a gain of you?" And in the Acts of the Apostles, where we are told of his taking leave of the elders of the church at Ephesus, he says, "I have coveted no man's silver, or gold, or apparel. Yea, ye yourselves know that these hands have ministered unto my necessities and to them that were with me." But had it been the aim of the apostles to obtain riches or honours, their ill success must surely have induced them to relinquish their pursuit.

"It is probable," says "the adversary," "that Mahomet and his first followers believed in his divine mission." In reply to this, I shall only take the liberty of referring my opponent to the prophet's celebrated journey to heaven, which may be seen in Prideaux, who gives the proper authorities.

The coercive methods of enforcing the profession of Christianity, mentioned by "the adversary" cannot affect the truth of the religion itself, if the preceding observations be just; because they do not suppose it incapable of being corrupted or perverted to pernicious purposes. The proper question is, have we sufficient reason to believe in its truth, prior to that period? If we have, that perversion could not render it false. And as to its not being extensively adopted as a self-denying religion, it will scarcely be denied that numbers suffered as martyrs in its cause long before it was "propagated by the sword." How then can its credibility be destroyed by its subsequent perversion; unless it be laid down as an intellible maxim, that none of the gifts of heaven can be abused or misapplied? But none are more ready than Unitarians, to acknowledge the early corruption of the Chris-

tian religion; and as Necessarians they consider it as a part of that evil, the introduction of which they believe to have been strictly unavoidable.

Under the second head, the original objection, viz. the unreasonableness of punishing men for necessary actions, seems to be given up, and another insisted on, which before was proposed under that head which related to Optimism. And it is admitted that "there may be something *plausible* in my reasoning, if it could be proved that the supposition of one pang which is felt, being excluded, involves a contradiction." But surely this is requiring me to prove a great deal merely to give an air of *plausibility* to my reasoning. How can this point be proved except by one who was perfectly acquainted with all the laws of nature, all the properties of matter, and the different constitutions of all organized beings?

But the position, that it is *highly probable* that pain and evil could not have been avoided, may, I conceive be made sufficiently evident without undertaking such an impossible task. Whatever proves the Divine benevolence will go far likewise towards proving the necessity of the existing evil. For would a kind and benevolent Being have suffered any evil to exist if it could have been prevented, and would answer no valuable purpose?—For proofs of the Divine goodness, I must refer to Archdeacon Paley, and other writers on Natural Theology.

In my first reply, I argued that "the senses which are the inlets of pleasure, must likewise as far as we know, be frequently the instruments of pain." This indeed is not to demonstrate "that the supposition of one pang which is felt, being excluded, involves a contradiction;" but it seems an hypothesis probable in itself, and of considerable weight towards reconciling the sufferings of the whole animal world with the goodness of God. Ought not my opponent in return, either to have shewn that this is not a probable supposition; or that if admitted it did not sufficiently vindicate the moral perfection of the Deity; or that notwithstanding his immutable rectitude and benevolence he might have introduced a great mass of evil, pain and suffering, into his creation, which he might easily have excluded, and which is not necessary to the production of substantial good? But instead

of this, without even noticing what I had said on the subject, he only asks "what I can do with the pains which oppress the irrational animal creation?" and if it be "capable of instruction in virtue;" I admit that it is not. I would prevent its misery if I could. Who that is not devoid of the feelings of humanity would not cordially concur with me? But is the Author of nature less benevolent than ourselves? Yet he has not excluded misery from his creation. I therefore conclude that the supposition of creating sensitive beings capable of enjoyment, but not liable to pain, does *somehow*, "involve a contradiction;" though it is a point that I will not undertake to demonstrate.

Under the third head, "A Churchman" affirms "that if the Divine will have established regular, uniform laws of nature, then no miracle is possible, if a miracle be a deviation from established laws." But how does this conclusion follow? Could not the Deity *possibly* deviate from the laws which he had established, if he saw fit? But it will perhaps be objected that it indicates some defect in the original plan, if it was afterwards found necessary to deviate from it. We know not however but these very deviations from the regular course of nature might be a part of the original plan. Indeed, there is no reason to doubt that they were. Unless we can suppose that something happened unexpectedly, in the order of nature, or the course of events, which induced the Creator to make different arrangements from what he at first intended. But why, it may be asked, were not things so constituted at first, as to require no deviation afterwards? I cannot tell. What the Deity *might* have done, I will not pretend to say; what he *has* done appears to me a much fitter subject of inquiry.

Still, "A Churchman" contends that miracles, if not impossible, are "surely improbable, if these laws of nature operate uniformly upon mind and matter, according to the original determination of the Divine mind!" And he asserts that "from this simple statement, every thinking mind may easily satisfy itself."—But I cannot be satisfied so easily. I perceive nothing in this whole paragraph but assertions without proofs. Yet perhaps this is a point of no very great importance; because many things that we may think improbable, will,

upon inquiry, be found true. And if miracles be not considered as so far improbable that the accounts of them ought not to be received, upon credible testimony, the truth of the position may be readily ceded. But what material advantage can be derived from the concession?

As no new remarks are made under the fourth head, the reader must decide for himself with respect to it, from what has already been said.

Under the fifth head, my opponent contends that a future state is contrary to all present appearances, but admits "that the declaration of the Lord of nature is a sufficient warrant for any expectation contrary to her appearances and laws." He however objects to the Unitarian mode of establishing that revelation which records his declarations on this head. His objections to that mode have already been considered in the first part of this letter; to which the reader is referred.

With respect to Optimism, he makes no remarks in addition to what occurred under the second head.

It cannot have escaped the notice of the reader that the principal objections in "A Churchman's" second letter relate to the evidence on which Christianity is founded. The punishment of necessary actions is not mentioned; the inefficiency of Christ's mission is not insisted on; the possibility of a future state is admitted, and the Divine declaration acknowledged a sufficient warrant for believing it. It appears then at last, that the irrationality with which Unitarians are charged, consists chiefly in their reliance on "*testimony merely human*." But why should this be thought so very irrational? Have mankind in general such an irresistible propensity to deceit that they cannot be trusted in any circumstances whatever? If not, why should Unitarians be derided for assenting to those narratives, which upon the fullest investigation appear to them worthy of credit?

At the conclusion of his letter "A Churchman," admits that "difficulties press upon every scheme which the mind of man can contemplate;" and asserts that "this admission if universally made completely establishes his object in this correspondence." I am as firmly convinced of the truth of this position as "A Churchman," can be. So far we are perfectly agreed. But I cannot be

thoroughly satisfied unless it be farther conceded that Unitarianism is attended with the fewest and the least. But let it not be thought that my object in this controversy is to triumph over an opponent who doubtless possesses talents and information far superior to my own. My aim is to vindicate a religion, a mode and profession of religion, which I esteem beyond all others pure and rational, and "worthy of all acceptance;" a religion inspiring no gloomy terrors, nor commanding any useless austerities; which represents the Deity as the kind and beneficent parent of his creatures, and powerfully inculcates universal benevolence.

I desire to entertain sentiments of respect and friendship for estimable characters of every persuasion; nor less for those who are not convinced that the Deity ever revealed his will to mankind. Yet I cannot conceive it to be a matter of no importance, what we believe. Enthusiastic, superstitious and illiberal ideas of religion, are evidently pernicious. And infidelity, though it may be thought to enlarge the views, expand the mind, and promote free and generous sentiments, may be not less injurious in a different way. It may contract our ideas of the obligations incumbent upon us: it may cause us to think some duties of little or no importance, which yet are of eternal and indispensable obligation. It is incumbent upon us as reasonable creatures to exercise our understandings in the discovery of truth; that we may not on the one hand, be led away by the follies and extravagancies of fanaticism; nor on the other, rashly and inconsiderately, give up the whole of revealed religion, without making due inquiry whether or not it be founded on evidence,

that ought to satisfy a candid and reflecting mind. For should it be found hereafter, that religion is true, and we have rejected it without a fair examination of its evidences and its doctrines, how can we be considered as guiltless?

My only aim is to promote inquiry. Let the different views of religion be canvassed with perfect freedom; and let those that will not bear the test of the most rigid examination, be ingenuously relinquished. Truth cannot be impaired by fair discussion; nor need its advocates ever be afraid to consider objections. I do not wish to believe Christianity itself, if its evidence prove to be no better than "a baseless fabric;" but am persuaded that it is founded on a rock; that every assault will only serve to manifest its strength; and that after every objection has been considered which ingenuity can devise; after it has been completely divested of human additions, and truly represented in its native simplicity, genuine Christianity will appear with the greater lustre, like gold purified in the furnace.

I wish Mr. Editor, I could have comprised my answer in a shorter compass; but knowing this to be my last opportunity of engaging in this cause, and reflecting on the importance of the point in dispute, I was unwilling to omit any thing that appeared likely to influence the minds of your readers. At the same time I wish them to attend with perfect impartiality to what *has* been, and to what *may* be advanced on the opposite side; and after duly considering both, to judge and decide for themselves. With this view, I shall be extremely happy to hear from my opponent again.

I remain, Sir, your's,

R. ALLCHIN.

MR. BROOKES, IN REPLY TO MR. DILLWYN, ON THE CIVILIZATION OF THE INDIANS.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

Bermondsey, Dec. 12, 1808. object of my remarks was to shew, as the Quakers in their

SIR, If you think the following publications on the civilization of the Indians had not taken any notice of it, that the government of the United States was, and had for some years been engaged in a similar work: and Mr. D. has

brought no evidence to prove the contrary. His first quotation is from the report of the committee of Pennsylvania friends, running from 1795 to 1805, or 1806, in which they say that before they sent any person among the Indians, they addressed a letter to the various tribes, accompanied with one from the Secretary of State, expressive of the approbation of the executive government of the U. S. i. e. it gave them permission to go among them for the purpose stated, and wished them success: here is not a word that that very government had appropriated ever since 1796, 15,000 dollars annually for that very purpose, nor the least intimation that the government of the U. S. did any thing like what they were doing. Next follows his quotation from the committee of Baltimore friends, during the same period, from which he quotes an address made by their committee to some Indians in 1804, in which they tell those Indians, "We believe it is in the heart of the President to assist you in cultivating the earth, and if you will do as we advise you, it will encourage him to continue to aid you in your endeavours:" which would be naturally taken for the good will that the President individually bore them: at least here was a fair opportunity to state what the government had done, and was doing, but they mention not a syllable of this, at a time when they could not be ignorant that the above sum was annually appropriated to that purpose by the government, but instead thereof, If you do what we advise you, what we are the promoters of, the President may be inclined to continue to aid you therein. Be-

fore they published their reports, I think it became them openly, candidly and fairly to have stated that the government was engaged in a similar work, if they had not wished to claim all the merit of it themselves; but not one word of this candour has Mr. D. produced. As the Monthly Reviewers and your Reviewers in the pages above referred to, consider the Quakers as the sole and only agents in this honourable work, from the perusal of their publications, it shews that I am not singular in considering them as laying claim to the merit of it.

Mr. D. next states that I am in an error in saying that a legacy of 5000*l.* was left to the Quakers wards that purpose: that is what I understood from conversing with the gentlemen there stated, and if an error I must have misunderstood them, but this does not affect the main point of my observations.

I must beg leave to inform Mr. D. that I have not used such hard words as arrogant and invidious, and as to a superficial reading shewing the erroneousness of my statement, that will better become his side of the argument than mine, for he considers the assent of the executive government and the good will of the President as amounting to a declaration of the Quakers, that the government were engaged in a similar work, and had met with considerable success therein; else his quotations are not relevant.

Mr. D. also talks about the difficulty, invidiousness and uselessness of appreciating strictly the merit of any body of men, but the investigation of truth I do not consider as useless, invidious or difficult: let the truth be

known and the whole truth too; what harm can ensue from it? The middle epithet perhaps more justly applies to his party, than to me, who in their publications have never mentioned the government being engaged in such an honourable application of part of the public money, especially as it is rare to meet with such enlightened conduct in a government: and therefore as the Quakers had published on the subject, and passed over these honourable views and actions with neglect, I wrote the above to set the civilization of the Indians in a truer light, as being effected both by the government of the U. S. and the Quakers.

In Mr. D.'s observations, the only evidence he exhibits of the Quakers' taking any notice of the conduct of the government, makes more against than for him: for he states that in a *late* address to the President, they had declared their grateful sense of the humane system pursued by the government; if this fully expresses the sense of the address of the Quakers, it seems to amount to this, We thank the government of the U. S. for pursuing the good work in which we are and have been engaged: yet until lately they have not made even this acknowledgment.

I remain your well-wisher,
J. BROOKES.

BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

STRICTURES UPON THE "IMPROVED VERSION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT." 1 TIM. i. 4, 15, and 18.

For the Monthly Repository.

Whenever I look upon the Improved Version of the New Testament, I cannot help feeling great regret that the Editors did not use the confidence, which their abilities most justly claimed, in producing an entirely new translation, but adopted for the basis of their work that of Newcome, which, in my opinion is very inferior, as it contains, almost in every page, instances of bad taste and incompetent criticism. I will illustrate this position where the volume accidentally opens.

1 Tim. i. 4. "Nor give heed to fables and endless genealogies, which minister *questions* rather than *the dispensation of God* which is by faith; so do." The fables here noticed were the fictions of Gnostics, who imagined a long race of Gods to descend from one Supreme Being. An account of them is to be found in the beginning of Irenæus; and nothing is more certain than that these fables were borrowed neither from the Pagan, nor the Oriental Philosophy, but from the Mosaic history by the mere personification of abstract ideas. The end of their base authors was to undermine the Gospel, the progress and influence of which they found themselves unable to counteract by open violence; and their immediate tendency was to kindle a

nimosities and altercations to the exclusion of those divine virtues, piety and benevolence, which formed the essence of Christianity. For *questions and the dispensation of God which is by faith* should therefore be read *disputes and godly improvement in the faith*. This, at least, is the meaning of the original; and Mr. Wakefield has so rendered the last clause. 6, "Now the end of *this charge to thee* is love out of a pure heart." The original of the *Italic* words is *ἡ παραγγελία*, which is a collective name to express the *divine commandments*, or *the doctrines of the gospel*. These doctrines the impostors professed, from sinister purposes to embrace; while they appeared by their conduct not to have known, or to have forgotten that the *end* of the commandment was *moral purity*. Of this the apostle admonishes Timothy, intending no doubt that he should enforce it on the wicked men, who seemed to stand in need of it. In this Version the meaning is widely mistaken; while the Common Translation is perfectly correct. The Gnostics denied the obligations and reasonableness of the divine law. Clement of Alexandria, in one place says of them, that they waged war with the Almighty by arraigning his law; and against their impiety in this respect, the words of Paul seem to have been levelled, when he says in verse 8th that *the law is good*. The original, *χρησθαι* to use, generally has its sense determined by the associate noun; thus, *χρησθαι τῷ καιρῷ* to use the opportunity, i. e. to seize it; *χρησθαι τῷ λόγῳ* to use an argument, i. e. to reason; *ὁμιλοῖς χρησθαι* to use birds, i. e. to pro-

phesy by means of birds. In the same manner *χρησθαι νόμῳ* to use a law means to obey it; and though *νομίμως* be a *paranomasia* suggested by *νόμος* in the preceding clause, it does not strictly mean *lawfully*, but *faithfully* or, *strictly*. In the Improved Version the whole verse is thus awkwardly rendered; "But we know that the law is good, if a man use it as the law requireth." I submit whether the last member would not be better thus, "if a man duly obey it."

The Gnostics, according to the express testimony of Irenæus, maintained that the duties enjoined by the law were not necessary for *them* to practise; as certain spiritual privileges, and not the moral virtues, entitled them to salvation. According to them, therefore, the divine precepts, however necessary to the faithful and virtuous followers of Jesus, were not obligatory upon the disciples of Gnosticism.—And this is the proposition, which the apostle directly contradicts; "The law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners, for the unholy and profane," &c. Here the apostle obliquely draws the character of the false teachers, and thus inculcates that the law, which they denied or perverted, was in force only against them and men of their description.

Ver. 15. "These are true words, and worthy to be received by all, that Christ came into the world, to save sinners; of whom I am a chief sinner." The repetition of the *Italic sinner* is very clumsy. But the verse appears to me not only inelegantly expressed, but to

be unfaithful to the original. The Pharisees and the higher classes of the Jews were exceedingly offended that our Lord addressed himself chiefly to *publicans* and *sinners*. Being eager to appropriate to themselves the blessings of the Messiah's kingdom, they were unwilling to have them extended to the lower classes, much less to the Gentiles. In reference to this selfish and haughty spirit, Jesus himself assured them that he came to call not the righteous but sinners to repentance, See Mat. ix. The apostle asserts the same thing; and it was extorted by the same temper, on the part of the false teachers, "It is a true doctrine, and worthy of all acceptance, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners," meaning that this was a doctrine unquestionably true, expressed in clear terms, and proved by indisputable evidence, and therefore deserving of unfeigned belief. The writer then asserts, not that the doctrine should be received by all, which is of course implied in the other proposition, but that it was founded on indisputable evidence, not to be shaken by those whose pride and bigotry led them to deny it.

The Gnostics taught that Christ was a man only in appearance, and one of those Gods which Plato and some other heathen philosophers supposed, under the name of demons, to exist between the Gods and men. The false and pernicious tenet that the Mediator between God and man was not one of the human race, but a *God* or *demon* was of course inculcated by the impostors in the church of Ephesus. And the apostle contradicts it in the most express terms. "There is one God, and

one Mediator between God and men, *the Man Christ Jesus*, i. e. Christ Jesus, who is really a *man*, and not as the false brethren maintain, a *God*. The question whether the Mediator was a *divine*, as the Gnostics maintained, or a *human* being, as the apostles taught, of course introduced another not less important, namely, whether, or not, he was a proper object of *worship*: And the apostle decides this question in a manner that must have appeared to Timothy the most decisive and unequivocal. In verses 15, 16, he represents himself, though a chief sinner, as obtaining mercy through the long suffering of Christ. He was, therefore, led to hint at the feelings, of which his distinguished benefactor under God was the proper object; and these were *faith* and *love*. He then adds "*But* unto the king eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honour and glory for ever and ever. Amen." Which is to this effect, "I owe to Christ through whom, sinful as I am, I have obtained mercy, my most cordial assent and affection; but the Supreme Father, whose attributes are infinite, who is God, and who is God alone, to the exclusion of every other being, is entitled to our religious homage." In the common version, the particle *but* δε is rendered *now*. The meaning of the writer is thus rendered abrupt and incoherent, and the mistake is adopted in the Improved Version.

Verse 18, may be thus rendered "This commandment I impress on thee, son Timothy, conformably to the prophecies which have previously furnished thee with the same, that thou mightest maintain a good (i. e. a successful),

warfare." Here the verbs *παρατίθεσθαι* to place by the side, or to graft upon, and *προαγείν* to lead before are here made by an easy metaphor to signify to impress, and to supply. The great commandment which the apostle inculcates on his pupil is that, which he had already decided in the preceding verse, that whatever feelings of gratitude and affection might be due to *Christ, God alone* was the proper object of religious glory and honour. In this fundamental principle of the Jewish Scriptures, Timothy had already been instructed, and his great master refers him to those prophecies or divine writings for two reasons; first to strengthen by their authority a commandment which is the foundation of the Jewish and Christian revelations; and, secondly, to defend those Scriptures themselves against the Gnostics who rejected, reviled and blasphemed them, and who introduced many other Gods, and Christ, among the number, as objects of divine homage. Against these artful foes of the gospel, Paul calls upon his young friend to arm himself with the doctrines of Moses and the prophets, and thus by holding forth the king eternal, as the only God, as the only Being entitled to honour and glory; and Jesus as only a man, and the only Mediator between God and men, to the exclusion of those divinities or demons

which were supposed to be occupied in a similar mediatorial office, to maintain a successful warfare.

The Primate and his Editors have mistaken the passage *toto calo*, who thus translate it; "This charge I commit unto thee, Son Timothy, according to the prophecies which went before concerning thee, that by them thou mightest war a good warfare." Mr. W. appears to me to have deviated still more widely from the truth. His Version is "That very charge, which by the authority which belongeth to me as a teacher, I entrust unto thee." In a note he adds, "Instead of *ἐπὶ σε*, the Æthiopic translator read *ἐπὶ μὲ*; and if that be not the genuine reading, and mine the true sense of the passage, it is, I confess, and always was totally unintelligible to me."

I cannot help expressing my surprise that a critic so conversant in the Greek as Mr. W. was, should not have seen, that *τὴν παραγγελίαν* in the preceding clause is to be supplied after *προαγοῦσας*,—"I deliver to you a commandment which the Scriptures, in which you have been educated, had already brought home to you." This is the sentiment, and it is justified by the construction, as well as by what we know of the previous education of Timothy.

THEOLOGUS.

To be continued.

STRICTURES UPON THE "IMPROVED VERSION OF THE NEW
TESTAMENT;" MATTHEW, CHAPTERS I.—VIII.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

SIR,

I am one of those, who waited with great impatience, and in a high state of expectancy, for the *Improved Version of the New Testament*, or of the Christian Code, and one of those, who, I fear, are egregiously disappointed. After reading some chapters, I could not help remarking, that the Editors were strangely misled in making a bishop their guide, who, however excellent he was as a man, a scholar and a fair inquirer, was in many respects unqualified for transfusing into our language the graceful simplicity of the style of the original glorious Gospel. I do not intend at present to criticise the subject at large, but shall content myself with making a few brief observations upon the first eight chapters of Matthew.

The introduction to the whole is generally excellent. The seventeenth verse of the first chapter is clearly spurious. The doubtful matter of that and of the second chapter, I entirely pass over. In the second verse of the third chapter I think the word *wilderness* better than its substitute *desert*, and the phrase *is at hand*, quite as good as that of *draweth near*. Here, then, it was a merely seeking for something new, to make any alteration in the old version. In the third verse we should read *who* instead of *that*, and this alteration we should make in all other passages, where the substantive to the relative is man. *Generation* in the seventh verse, I think preferable to *offspring*, and the *wrath*

to come, or the *approaching wrath*, to the *anger which is about to come*; and I also prefer *now also the axe*, and *hewn down*, in the old version of the tenth verse, to the *axe also*, and *cut down*. In the 12th verse, *burn up* is better than *burns*; and in the 16th *lighting* than *coming*.

In the fourth chapter and third verse, *and when the tempter comes* or *the tempter having come*, is more agreeable to the original than *the tempter came*. In the fifth verse, it was unnecessary to change *proceedeth* into *goeth forth*. In the 9th verse, *will I* should be retained instead of *I will*. In the 18th verse, as the word *Jesus* is in the original, we should not read, *as he walked*, but, *as Jesus was walking*, or *walked*. In the 19th verse, I would say, *follow me*, or rather *come hither, follow me*, in preference to *come after me*. In the 23d verse there was no occasion for substituting *the glad tidings*, instead of *the Gospel*, and *healing* is perhaps a better word than *curing*. In the 25th verse we should read *many*, πολλοι, instead of *great* multitudes.

In the fifth chapter, I would continue the word *blessed*, we being familiarized to it as more forcible than the word *happy*. *Poverty of spirit*, as might be shewn in a note below, means the direct opposite to a worldly disposition. *That* before *hunger*, in the sixth verse, should be rendered *who*; and so in the 10th verse, *who are persecuted*. In the 11th verse, we should either read all *kinds*, or keep to the old

version, and say *all manner*. In the 12th verse, we again have *that* instead of *who*. In the 15th verse, a *bushel* is more intelligible than a *measure*. In the next verse, *that* when relating to our heavenly Father is almost as shocking as *which*.

The word *whosoever* in the 19th verse, and in all other passages where it occurs, should be changed into *whoever*, there being no occasion for the middle syllable *so*. *Observe* seems preferable to *perform*. *To those of old times*, or *to the ancients*, and not *by*, is the true reading in the 21st verse, and in other subsequent passages. But, *commit* is more expressive than *do*. *Thou shalt commit no murder*, &c. *In danger of*, is perhaps better than *liable to*, and *wrathfully say, thou apostate*, than *say, thou fool*. In the 26th verse, we meet with *thou wilt*, an Irishism, instead of *thou shalt*, and in the next verse we have *adultery* very improperly changed into *whoredom*. The hissing words, *Yes, yes*, in the 37th verse, degrade the subject. It is wonderful, how any one could think this version an improvement of the dignifying language, *Yea, yea; nay, nay*. In the 42d verse, read, *who*—*who*, for *that—that*. Correct in the same manner, the 44th and 45th verses. *What do ye that is excellent*, in the 47th verse, does not convey the force of the original. It should be *what extraordinary thing do ye*, or *what do ye more than others?* In the 48th verse, for *that* read *who*.

The following passages, in the 6th chapter, require amendment. *Acts of righteousness*, and *Father that* in the 1st verse. *Doest*, distributest, in the 2d verse. *Doest*

in the 3d verse. In the 21st verse, *will be*, better than *will your heart be*. In the 23d verse *enlightened*. In the 24th verse, *wealth*. 26th verse, *much better than*, why not *differ much from*.

The seventh chapter, and 5th verse, *Thou wilt* for *shalt thou*. In the 8th verse *that—that—that*. In the 11th verse, *that—that*. In the 12th verse, *whatsoever*. In the 13th verse, *many there are*, better than *there are many*. In the 14th verse, *how strait*. In the 21st verse, *that—that*. In the 27th verse, *The streams*, why not *the rivers*, or *the floods*.

The eighth chapter, and 3d verse, *was made clean*, was removed, or, *cleaned away*. In the 7th verse, *cure*, better *heal*. In the 8th verse, *command by word*, is shocking, *speak the word only*, or, *only pronounce the word*: In the 11th verse, *place themselves at table*. In the 12th verse, *put forth*, no improvement of the old version, nor so expressive of the original. In the 15th verse, *lying on a bed*. There is no mention of a bed in the text. *Lying*, or *cast*, or *thrown down*, perhaps by the weakness arising from her disease. In the 16th verse, *that*. In the 20th verse *roosts*. In the 28th verse, *coming out*. In the 33d verse, *that*.

Notwithstanding these remarks I much value the present version, for the light which it throws upon some mistranslated and spurious texts and particularly, *God be blessed for ever*, in Romans, and the 7th verse of first John the fifth. The history of the woman taken in adultery in John's Gospel appears to me to be genuine, as it so manifestly accords with the language of Jesus, though it is omitted in some copies. *The*

transcribers could not well avoid thing more. In the 25th verse of the passing over some passage, the eighteenth chapter of the Acts, which they would be unwilling to we read that Apollos *taught ex-* correct, lest it should depreciate *actly the words of the Lord*, and their manuscripts. We should yet it is said in the next verse, that not therefore reject those passages, Aquila and Priscilla *explained to* which are wanting in some copies, *him the doctrine of God more ex-* unless they be contradictory to *actly*. The old version is evident- the other parts of the Gospel. I ly preferable. W. H. shall only mention at present one

STRICTURES UPON THE "IMPROVED VERSION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT."—AUTHOR OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

To the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

SIR,

Nov. 7. says, (page 7,) "Origen, (A. D. 230,) the disciple of Clement, often cites this Epistle as St. Paul's. He expresses himself thus: 'The same Paul, in the epistle to the Hebrews, says, *In these last days, he hath spoken to us by his Son, &c.*' In the margin, he refers to several passages in Origen's works, particularly, *Contra Celsum*, p. 143.

At the end of the epistle to the Hebrews, in the new Improved Version, I observe the following Note.—"This epistle which contains many important observations and wholesome truths, mingled indeed with some *far-fetched analogies and inaccurate reasonings*, was probably written before the destruction of Jerusalem.—But by whom it was written is uncertain. Origen says that no one can tell who was the author of it. It has been ascribed to Paul, to Barnabas, &c. But if Origen, the most learned and inquisitive writer in the third century, could not discover the author, it is in vain for us to attempt it."

Now, Sir, without any remark on the above clause, which I have distinguished by *italics*, I beg leave to refer your readers to a very able and learned disquisition on the subject of this note, by Mr. Hallett, prefixed to his Supplement to Mr. Peirce's Paraphrase on the Epistle to the Hebrews, from whence it appears to me, that the above statement of Origen's opinion is not correct. This author

Mr. Hallett then makes a quotation from Eusebius, which probably the writer of the above note had imperfectly in his recollection. "Eusebius tells us, (says he,) that Origen wrote Homilies on the Epistle to the Hebrews, in which he delivers his opinion thus,—That the *style* of the epistle has not the homeliness of the apostle's, (referring to 2 Cor. xi. 6.) whereas this epistle is composed in pure Greek. It is my opinion that the *thoughts* are the apostle's, but the language and composition owing to some one who remembered the apostle's doctrine, and committed it to writing as a scholiast does what is dictated by his master. If therefore any church esteems this to be an epistle of Paul, it de-

serves to be commended for it; ancient writers, are well worthy for the ancients have rightly handed it down to us as an epistle of Paul. But God only knows who wrote the epistle." On this last clause the assertion in the above note, concerning Origen's ignorance of the author, seems to have been founded. Whereas, from the connexion nothing can be clearer than that Origen only meant to say, that he knew not who was the scribe or amanuensis.

The following remarks of Mr. Hallett, and the testimonies which he produces from various other

the perusal of all who wish for satisfaction on the present subject. From thence it is to me abundantly evident, that though Paul might not write the epistle as we now have it in Greek, yet that he was the real author of it. It is highly probable that to the Hebrews he should write in the Hebrew language, and not less so that some other person should translate it into Greek, which will naturally account for the difference in the style between this and his other epistles. I am, &c.

P. H.

REVIEW.

"STILL PLEAS'D TO PRAISE, YET NOT AFRAID TO BLAME."

Pope.

ART. I.—*The Benevolence of God displayed in the Revelation of a Future State of perfect Happiness. A Farewell Sermon, delivered at the Baptist Church, Taunton, October 16, 1808.* By Thomas Southwood Smith. 8vo. pp. 34. Crosby.

This sermon is the production of a vigorous imagination. The subject is interesting, and the preacher treats it in a manner that is creditable to the feelings of his heart.

ART. II.—*The Consolations of Orthodoxy.* 12mo. pp. 34. 6d. Sherwood, and Co.

Irony is an edged tool. It but must be laughed away. Who befits only the hand of a master. It has indeed two edges, and may according to the design of him that uses it, be turned against either error or truth, vice or virtue. We protest against the maxim that ridicule is the test of truth.

At the same time, it must be confessed that there are absurdities and follies in the religious world which cannot be reasoned, would gravely argue on the subject, which once distressed the mind of Dr. Johnson, of the lawfulness of taking cream in tea on the morning of Good Friday? Whether the topics which the author of this little tract plays upon be equally proper for ridicule, the reader must determine for himself, when he learns that they are the Trinity, the depravity of hu-

man nature, the imputed righteousness of Jesus Christ, and the other articles of the *Evangelical* faith, which are perhaps more irrational than ridiculous, and (as has been said of devotion,) "too ponderous for the wings of wit."

The following passage may serve as a specimen of the work.

"Let us suppose a robe of righteousness, nay the robe of the righteousness of the blessed Son of God put over us, in consequence of which, God sees no

iniquity in us; what a blessed thing is this! Full as I am of sin, of evil passions, and though my soul is like a cage of unclean birds, yet God sees it not; the garment without covers all. How many thousands wrap themselves up in this garment, and in the supposed enjoyment of it possess joys unspeakable, and hopes of immortality.

That spotless robe which he hath wrought,

Shall deck us all around;

Nor by the piercing eye of God,

One blemish shall be found.

DODDRIDGE."

ART. III.—*A more extended Discussion in Favour of Liberty of Conscience, recommended by the Rev. Christopher Wyvill.* 8vo. pp. 22. Second Edition. Johnson.

Mr. Wyvill is a veteran in the universal liberty in matters of cause of liberty and reform. He religion. Their application will is a clergyman of the church of certainly have the more weight England; his opinions do not coming from persons professing oblige him to leave the establish- the national faith. A correspond- ment; but he lately, from a prin- ence however, is invited from all ciple of duty and conscience, of every sect and party that have resigned the living of Black the cause of toleration at heart, Notley, in the county of Essex, whose efforts will be welcomed and thankfully acknowledged. (see M. Repos. Vol. i. p. 667.)

Still anxious, in advanced age, We cannot but wish success to to serve mankind, Mr. W. pro- this truly patriotic and Christian poses in this publication to pro- design. It is honourable to En- mote a discussion on the rights glishmen and worthy of the ge- of conscience, which shall lead nuine disciples of Christ. But to the abolition of all the perse- we are not sanguine in our ex- cuting statutes which disgrace pectations of the result; yet it our statute book, and to a com- would be wrong to discourage the plete toleration. He thinks the plan. What could be more im- debates in parliament on the probable than that Clarkson should subject of Catholic emancipation, have succeeded in destroying the have prepared the public mind for accursed trade in African flesh the discussion on general princi- and blood? And perhaps there is ples. He and a select band of now as general an abhorrence of churchmen have united, for the persecution for conscience sake, as purpose of furthering the great in the outset of his philanthropic object. Only one dissenter, Dr. career there was of the Slave-trade. Disney, is admitted into the as- This work shall be always at the sociation. It is their intention to service of Mr. Wyvill and his present a petition to Parliament, friends, who have publicly declar- in the next session, in behalf of ed their enmity to religions into-

lerance; and shall faithfully record their proceedings, congratulating them upon every triumph and applauding them even in defeat.

We earnestly recommend our readers to peruse and to circulate this little tract, and to communicate to us their ideas upon the subject.

With pleasure we observe, by an advertisement, at the end of the pamphlet, that Mr. Wyvill, in aid of his generous design, has lately published a new edition of Mr. Locke's "Letter concerning Toleration," which is sold by Johnson, price Eighteenpence.

ART. IV.—*Christian Liberty Advocated: a Discourse, delivered June 29, 1808, at the Unitarian Chapel, in Lincoln.* By Henry Hunt Piper. 8vo. pp. 27. Longman and Co.

Liberty, says Mr. Piper, is a sound by which every generous mind is roused, and a treasure of which no tongue can pronounce the value. It includes, he adds, a thousand blessings, and is itself the greatest with which our nature can be honoured. And he proceeds in a style at once elegant and manly, to shew that "Christian liberty" consists in a man's being delivered from the dominion of sin; freed from those slavish terrors of superstition, which are caused by mistaken notions of the character and government of God; and set at liberty in religious concerns, from the restraint of civil authority and the fetters of ecclesiastical tyranny.

Mr. Piper pronounces (p. 25,) a high eulogium on the Rev. Francis Stone, lately ejected from the church of England, by the decision at Doctors' Commons,

"whose name," he says, "must be from this time, enrolled amongst the names of those who have been willing to sacrifice every thing for truth's sake and their conscience."

This discourse, in which we believe Mr. Piper appears before the public for the first time, and appears certainly in a high character, as the judicious and courageous advocate of the best of causes, that of truth and liberty, was delivered at the annual meeting of the Northern Unitarian Society, of which an account was given in our *Intelligence* department, p. 402. It is not the least benefit of our Unitarian associations that they draw forth into public view the talents of our ministers which might otherwise be seen and admired only in a limited circle.

ART. V.—*Religious Intolerance Reprobated: a Sermon delivered at the Unitarian Chapel, in Lincoln, June 29, 1808.* By John Grundy. 8vo. pp. 28. Longman and Co.

This discourse, as well as that just reviewed, was delivered before the Northern Unitarian Book Society, at their last anniversary;

this in the evening, the former in the morning. Mr. Grundy, like Mr. Piper, now comes under our notice as reviewer, for the first

time*; and it is with inexpressible pleasure we perceive our young ministers introducing themselves to public notice as the enemies of all intolerance, the friends of universal liberty. Here is the true foundation of Protestant Non-conformity and of Unitarianism.

We could not analyze the discourse before us, without taking up greater room than we usually allot to single sermons; but we beg leave to recommend it to our readers, as a complete refutation of all the pleas for persecution, a manly and spirited exposure of the deformity of bigotry.

ART. VI.—*The Church of England incompletely reformed. A Sermon, preached on the occasion of the General Fast, Feb. 17, 1808. By George Somers Clarke, D. D. Vicar of Great Waltham, in Essex. 8vo. pp. 39. White.*

As odd a Fast Sermon as Mr. Stone's was a *Visitation* Sermon! Dr. Clarke's text is Jer. vii. 3, *Amend your ways*; which he addresses, he says, not so much to his hearers or to the people at large, as to the priests and rulers of the nation, whom he calls upon to *reform* (not themselves, but) the version of the *first lessons* of scripture appointed to be read by the ritual of the established church. A parochial minister he adds, is compelled to read psalms and first lessons in translations, which frequently mock and deride his knowledge of the original, disgust him with their absurdity, inadequacy or impropriety, and confuse him with shame for his church, from a consciousness of their being unintelligible to his congregation and scarcely less so to himself.

It must have been matter of wonder, if not of admiration to the usual attendants at a country parish church to have heard so many learned emendations of the version of the "first lessons" successively proposed and recommended, according to "a new

metrical theory" of the author's own discovery,—such erudite declamation on the captivity in which the clergy have been holden to "vowel points," and on the glory of "the antemasoretic text"—and such a self complacent description of the preacher's qualifications as an emendator of the "first lessons," he having resided "twenty years, before the last thirteen, in a place of learning."

We would not withhold our tribute of applause from Dr. Clarke's learning or his zeal for reform, but we wish that as an enlightened and liberal reformer, he had not spoken so haughtily of *sectaries*, or so dogmatically on the inalienability of the temporal possessions of the church. On this latter subject we would recommend to his notice the luminous arguments and splendid eloquence of Mr. (now Sir James) Mackintosh, in his *Vindiciæ Gallicæ*, who shews that church lands have none of the characters of property. "It has not hitherto been supposed (says this equal combatant of Mr. Burke's) that

* We have read with great satisfaction a Sermon of Mr. Grundy's, preached at Nottingham, February 21, 1808. being the Sunday following the last General Fast-day, in which there is an animated and eloquent protest against the *Copenhagen piracy*. We regret that it was printed only and not published. See our List of Books, p. 225.

any class of public servants are territorial pension is no more propriety than a pecuniary one." They are *salaried** by the state for the performance of certain duties. Judges are *paid* for the distribution of justice; *kings* for the execution of the laws; soldiers, where there is a mercenary army, for public defence; and priests, where there is an established religion, for public instruction. The mode of their payment is indifferent to the question. It is generally in rude ages by land, and in cultivated periods by money. But a

In one short concluding paragraph, Dr. Clarke applies his curious discourse to the Fast-day. The blind attachment of his countrymen to the present obscure and corrupt version of the prophetic books of scripture is, he thinks, a species of idolatry if not of hypocrisy; and he is of opinion that to *amend our ways* in this particular is the surest safeguard against "the modern Assyrian, the rod of God's anger."

ART. VII.—*The Simplicity of the Christian Doctrine: a Sermon, preached at Dudley, July 19, 1808, before the Unitarian Tract Society.* By John Kentish. 12mo. pp. 37. 1s. Belcher and Son, Birmingham.

The Birmingham or Warwickshire Tract Society, differs from the other Unitarian Book Societies in two particulars; it circulates only tracts or pamphlets, and a less annual subscription constitutes a member. This is the first sermon preached on its behalf, which has been laid before the public, and is we trust an earnest of a succession of equally able defences and urgent recommendations of the Unitarian doctrine.

With his accustomed perspicuity and ability, Mr. Kentish from 1 Cor. i. 22, 23, 24, shews that the simplicity of the Christian Revelation, is presumptive of its truth and excellence and favourable to its efficacy; inquires whether, and to what extent, the popular system of faith is characterized by simplicity; represents the peculiar obligations under which persons who embrace what they conceive to be the simple

gospel, are brought not merely to preserve it entire, but to aim at its universal diffusion; and lastly, suggests some of the best means for the accomplishment of this object.

Gladly should we make extracts from this excellent discourse, if we were able to give them a place in the present number. One only, relating to the *Unitarian Fund*, can we insert—our readers will we trust themselves peruse, and promote the circulation of the discourse.

"I rejoice that an attempt is making to convey more effectually the glad tidings of his [Christ's] religion to the poor, by means of popular preaching: and you will join, I am persuaded, your wishes and prayers with mine that the measures employed may be wisely adapted to the great importance of the end. May I take the liberty of recommending that one of these measures be the education of young men of piety and talents, with a specific view to the nature of the service in which they are engaged?" pp. 29, 30.

* "Ils sont ou *salarisés*, ou mendians, ou voleurs." They are either *salaried*, or *beggars*, or *robbers*.—was the expression of M. Mirabeau, respecting the priesthood.

MONTHLY RETROSPECT OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS;

OR,

The Christian's Survey of the Political World.

THE great Warrior of the earth continues his progress, conquering and to conquer. The events that have taken place, confound the politician. The emperor of the French threatened to overthrow the decrees of his enemies, and to plant his banners on the walls of Madrid and Lisbon. The first part of his threat he has already executed, and there seems little reason to doubt that he will perform the latter part of his promise. Scarcely had he set foot in Spain, when he commenced his warlike operations: his troops marched in various directions, and victory every where followed his steps. All the expectations formed on the energy of the Spaniards, and the co-operation of the English, have been disappointed. The latter have been far from the scene of action, and the former no where in sufficient force to counteract the vigour of a numerous and well disciplined army. The more we consider the feats of this wonderful man, and the counsels of his enemies, the more are we wrapt in admiration of the passing events, and of the things that are to follow. The Christian has daily reason for patience and resignation to the will of God; the worldly politician must see the futility of his schemes.

A few months ago, Spain was supposed to be in complete insurrection against the French. In the South their force was annihilated; the new king had fled from Madrid; the remains of their armies were concentrated under the Pyrenees; and it might have been thought impossible, that they could resist a nation in arms, assisted by a powerful people, capable of supplying them with all that is denominated the sinews of war. But the French remained safe in their quarters; reinforcements arrived without interruption; and every thing seemed to be calculated, that the emperor should take the field at his own time and to the greatest advantage. An army from England, more numerous than the French, might easily have been landed on the shores of Biscay: but the summer passed away, and then the strength of this country was sent to Portugal, where it could not possibly have any effect on

the great point of attack in Spain: and when a body was sent to Spain, it was sent to the North West point at such a distance from the scene of action, that it was of no more use than if it had been in England. It might perhaps with the fugitives delay for a short time the conquest of Galicia, but this could have little effect on the main operations.

Buonaparte, as soon as he had crossed the Pyrenees, put all his forces in motion. His schemes had been previously well laid and digested. He was now at the head of a very numerous army; his most experienced generals were around him; large bodies were following him from France; provisions were in plenty, and every separate corps completely provided. He himself kept with the main body: two armies were detached, the one on his right the other on his left to disperse the Spaniards in arms in those quarters. Blake commanded in Biscay, and made a vigorous resistance. But the repeated attacks of the French drove him to the hills, and at last his army was completely dispersed. Thus all Biscay was subdued; its principal towns were taken; and the fugitives retreated into Galicia, where was an English army under General Baird, making a tedious march from Corunna to join General Moore in Spain.

The army on the left was equally successful. It followed the course of the Ebro to attack the army under General Castanos, and by a successful manœuvre completely broke it, and compelled it to a precipitate flight. Freed from all apprehensions on the right and left, Buonaparte marched towards Burgos, where he made an immense seizure of war, and thence directed his course towards Madrid. An English army had marched from Lisbon towards the plains of Castille under the command of general Moore. It was said to have got as far as Salamanca; but the disasters of the allies compelled it to retreat. Thus the country was open to Madrid, unless its inhabitants, reinforced by an army from the South, would come out and oppose the enemy. Strong resolutions were made by the central Junta of the citi-

zens. The town was to make a stand, and defy the conqueror; but the fatal news arrived almost as soon as these resolutions, that the place had surrendered by capitulation to the conqueror.

His armies are now pouring fast into Spain. All connected with each other, follow a certain and well-digested plan. On the other side the Spanish and English force is broken, divided into armies, separated at vast distances from each other, and without any prospect of co-operation. As far as we now know of them the state of Spain is desperate. The country from the Pyrenees is open to Buonaparte, the direct road to Madrid being filled with his troops. An army in Biscay keeps the whole North West of Spain quiet. The retreat of the English leaves all Castille and Leon and the Country near Portugal incapable of injuring the French. The defeat of Castanos' army has opened the way to Barcelona, and a large body of troops has probably been detached to restore, what the French will call order, in Catalonia. The conqueror from Madrid is now directing his course southwards, probably towards Cadiz, by which he will set at liberty a large body of his captive soldiers and sailors, and perhaps he may regain possession of his fleets, for we do not know of any strength sufficient in Andalusia to resist him.

The rapidity of these conquests brings back to our minds the feats of a Nebuchadnezzar, a Cyrus, an Alexander, or a Cæsar. The world at different periods has seen these warriors new modelling the earth. Man is said to be a reasonable being, but when he acts in great masses, force is the general instrument used. On the necessity of such changes being operated, we must look to the state of the world prior to them before we attempt to complain. The evils may be severely felt by the existing generation, but it might also be the case that deep rooted prejudices could not have been destroyed but by these violent means. What can be more contemptible and impious than the insinuations of the Spaniards to the abominations worshipped in that country? Had they been successful, their images would have continued high in veneration. There is no reason to believe, that even their horrid Inquisition would have been destroyed. We may lament the fate of a nation, that loses its independence: but, if it has been brutalized by a bad government, if an odious tyranny over

the mind has long been exercised, let us not arraign Providence, if it raises up instruments to destroy the most abominable superstition and bigotry. We see but little way into the decrees of Providence, but this every Christian must know, that kings and nations are amenable to the laws of God, and the intolerance and bigotry of Spain cannot be reconciled with any principle of Christianity.

Success has attended the arms of Buonaparte's ally. Finland has bowed to the yoke of Russia. The forces of Sweden are retreating, and an armistice has been concluded, which leaves Russia in possession of a very extensive territory. In the terms of this armistice it is insisted upon by the Russians, that the Lutheran ministers who had fled, should have liberty to return to their respective parishes. Russia does not interfere with the religion of its subjects; it is content with civil obedience. The future fate of Sweden no man can at present anticipate: the terms of the conference of the two emperors are not known.

Austria still remains quiet. The convulsions of Spain have not induced this power to risk greater losses than it has already experienced through its own excessive imprudence. Its neighbour Turkey is putting on an unusual face of activity. Its Vizier is full of zeal, and sensible of the necessity of great exertions to preserve the falling state. It is not yet reconciled to Britain, and our attempts to negotiate have been hitherto abortive. It is reduced to a great strait; whichever body of infidels it trusts, little security can be expected; and its own strength is not sufficient for protection, unless it should be concentrated with a degree of wisdom, which cannot be expected in so uncivilized a state and barbarous a government.

Peace indeed is likely to be for a long time a stranger to Europe: and if we cross the Atlantic, where she has so long resided, her longer sojourn is dubious. A most interesting debate occupies the attention of the United States. The wars of Europe had so interrupted their commerce, that it was thought wiser to cut off all intercourse with this part of the world, than to risk a war with either of the contending powers. In the mean time, applications were made to the hostile powers to regard the rights of neutrals, and to rescind their orders. Both powers have refused. England has stated, that her orders were necessary

Bishop Tette.

by way of retaliation, and the complaining country must have recourse to that power which has caused the injustice. The President, in his message to the Congress, laments the situation of the country, and leaves to its wisdom to determine the prolongation or cessation of the embargo. The question was immediately taken up by the Congress, and the result is impatiently expected in England. The commercial body will unite for the repeal of the embargo: the inconvenience of it must be very generally felt, but there may be a sufficient number to judge of its advantages over the horrors of war.

In fact the question is a most important one, and it will be discussed with all the warmth that various interests can excite. Will the still voice of wisdom be heard in such a tumult of contending parties? The voice of thy brother's blood crieth to me from the earth, was the solemn sound, uttered on the first murder perpetrated in the world. What was the occasion of that murder? and for what cause will so many murders be occasioned, if the States should enter into a war with either or both of the parties, that are desolating their own world with blood? Is not America sufficient for its own existence? Should Almighty vengeance extirpate the tigers of Europe, submerge that unhappy continent, and destroy its floating batteries, would America be incapable of supporting itself? May not the miserable contentions of the old world be the means of promoting internal improvements in the new, and is it not better to suffer temporary inconvenience, than to enter into a course of warfare, which can assimilate us only to brutes? After all for what are we to lose the lives of our countrymen and destroy the lives of Europeans? That we may export some of our commodities to Europe, and re-

ceive in return its produce! By this a quantity of wealth may eventually be obtained; but will not the expense of one year's war destroy the gain of many years' commerce, and besides is all the commerce of the world worth the expence of human blood that may be shed in its defence? In the old world life is not rated high; but in a new country the value of human labour is duly appreciated. What can justify war but absolute necessity?

We shall expect the result of the debate with some anxiety. We wish to see how far the new world is improved, whether it is kept in chains by the prejudices of its ancestors. The crisis is very extraordinary. Such a debate has not before been brought on the great stage of the world. The hostile powers in Europe having refused to rescind their orders, America has no alternative but to continue its embargo or to unite with one of these parties. In uniting with France it unites with an ally, that can render it no assistance on the seas. In uniting with England it is immediately banished from the shores of the Continent. In continuing the embargo it has no vent for the surplus of its stores. Inconveniences result from every step that it takes. The grand question is; which is attended with the least inconveniences? Here the politician will find himself embarrassed: surely then much ought to be endured before a nation rushes into the horrors of war. America has no idle people to employ merely to cut the throats of their neighbours! they have a sufficiency of lands uncultivated, that requires all their population: and, when they can lead honest lives at home, why should they enter into a state, which is necessarily the parent of vice in a good country, and useful only in the old world as a corrector of vicious and profligate habits?

OBITUARY.

ADDITION TO FORMER OBITUARY.

BISHOP YORKE, (p. 571, 2.) was in 1772, a member of *The Clerical Assembly*, who met at Tennyson's Library, near the Mews, with a view, as they expressed themselves, "to request a revival of the articles and liturgy and forms of subscription; but

judged it fitting to consult first their spiritual superiors, and to be directed by them." This association was different from that of the *Clerical Petitioners* meeting at the Feathers' Tavern, Strand. The difference was that the *Petitioners* determined to apply to the Legislature

Rev. William Humphryes.

for relief, whereas the *Assembly* were for applying to the bishops alone: a measure which could never be expected to have any effect, and which was perhaps adopted to hinder or weaken the force of the petition to Parliament.—*Porteus*, the present Bishop of London, was of the Assembly. (See Mr. Lindsey's *Indicia Priestleiana*. p. 51, 52.)

September 18th 1808, at his house in Hammersmith, the REV. WILLIAM HUMPHRYES, in the 47th year of his age. He was blessed with a religious as well as liberal education, and at the early age of nine years evinced a sense of the importance of religion, which he never afterward lost. His views were fixed on the ministry, and by his friends he was designed for the Established Church; but he became, on full conviction, a decided, though a liberal Protestant Dissenter, from the perusal of Mr. Palmer's *Nonconformist's Catechism*. In the year 1778, he entered as a student, at the Academy at Homerton, then under the direction of Dr. Conder, Dr. Gibbons, and Dr. Fisher; about which time he became a member of the Church in White Row, Spitalfields, then under the pastoral care of the Rev. Nath. Trotman, now of the Rev. John Goode. On leaving Homerton, he was soon invited to preach to a small and decayed congregation at Haverhill, in Suffolk, where that county borders on Essex and Cambridge-hire. Here he was ordained to the pastoral office, Dec. 10th, 1783. His labours were acceptable and successful; but in the year 1791, he was laid aside from the ministry by illness growing out of a feeble constitution. He then returned to London and united himself (as a private member) to the church in Fetter-lane, at that time under the pastoral care of Dr. Davies, now living in a venerable age at Reading. Relaxation restoring the vigour of his bodily and mental powers, he ventured to appear occasionally in the pulpits of his friends, and consented to be a preacher at the Thursday evening lecture, which was then held at New Court, Carey-Street, and is now carried on with great acceptance at Fetter-Lane: and in the spring of the year 1792 he was so much recruited as to undertake the office of morning preacher to the Independent congregation at Hammersmith, to which his companion at the academy and friend Mr. Robert Winter, was pastor

and afternoon preacher. When Mr. Winter, in the year 1796, removed from Hammersmith, to become the afternoon preacher at Hanover-Street, Long-Acre, (where Mr. Worthington was morning preacher) Mr. Humphryes was invited to succeed him in the pastorship, to which he readily consented. On the 22d of March in that year, he was publicly *set apart*, the Rev. John Winter of Newbury, Berks, preaching on the occasion. Here he continued useful and beloved till his death, his ministry being interrupted only by illness. Three several times he was attacked by the rupture of blood-vessels; the last attack was fatal. It took place after the services of Sunday, July 10th. A journey to Canterbury afforded him no relief; he grew worse and worse; was brought home at his earnest desire, scarcely alive, on Tuesday, Sept. 27th; and died the next day. He was interred in Bunhill Fields' Burying-Ground, Oct. 6th, when the Rev. W. Jay, of Bath, delivered a funeral oration over his grave. On the afternoon of the Sunday following, a funeral sermon was preached for him, in his former pulpit, by the Rev. Robert Winter. The Sermon and Address are published, and have furnished materials for this article.—Mr. H. appears to have been an excellent if not an eminent man. He possessed a good understanding and an amiable heart. If not a scholar, his mind was well-informed. His sentiments were those of Calvin; his creed grew straighter with his years; and like many dissenting ministers of the present day he seemed alarmed by the prevalence of free enquiry into a more evangelical strain of preaching; i. e. a strain in which certain peculiar doctrines are perpetually insisted on, and made the grounds of all religion, and the only motives to virtue. As a preacher, Mr. H. was not adapted to the multitude. His Sermons were not calculated for the meridian of the Tabernacle. But if he did not enjoy popularity he never sought it. He possessed the respect, esteem, confidence and love of his own flock, who testified their sentiments by many substantial acts of kindness.—It deserves to be mentioned in praise of Mr. Humphryes, that he courted the company of young students for the ministry, and associated them frequently at his table; remembering, as he was accustomed to say, how much he was gratified and encouraged by the notice of senior mi

Mr. Edward Love.—Mrs. Bromley.—Mrs. Pool.

ministers when he was himself a student.—He was severely tried in domestic life, but was always calm and contented. He believed and lived up to the truths of religion which he preached.

Nov. 2d 1808, aged 77. Mr. EDWARD LOVE, of Headcorn, Kent. He was ordained an Elder over the General Baptist Church in that place in the year 1765, and discharged the duties of his office with honour to himself and advantage to others; but had been obliged, through the infirmities of age, to relinquish his public labours a considerable time previous to his death. In his religious sentiments, he was a decided Unitarian, having been led to renounce the Arian hypothesis, which he maintained in the early part of his life, through reading Dr. Lardner's 'Letter on the Logos.' This work in conjunction with the Sermons of that eminent Divine, he was influenced to peruse by the recommendation of the late Rev. Mr. Wiche, of Maidstone, with whom he was for many years in habits of intimacy. The deceased was eminently distinguished for candour, humility and uprightness. In the different relations of a husband, parent and friend he acquitted himself with credit, and by the mildness of his disposition and the uniform rectitude of his conduct adorned the religion which he professed and taught. His interment took place on the Wednesday following his death, when a discourse was delivered on the occasion from 1 Peter v. 4. to a crowded auditory, apparently anxious to pay this last tribute of respect to the memory of a man deservedly esteemed for his excellent qualities and sterling worth.

Of no distemper—of no blast he died—
But fell like autumn fruit that mellow'd long:

E'en wonder'd at, because he dropp'd no
sooner—

Heav'n seem'd to wind him up for three
score years and ten,

Yet freely ran he on a few years more,
'Till like a clock worn out with eating
time,

The wheels of weary life at last stood
still.

Headcorn, Nov. 28th, 1808.

JOHN COUPLAND.

Died at Islington, Sunday the 20th of November, 1808, in the 49th year of her age, Mrs. SARAH BROMLEY, wife of Nathaniel W. Bromley, Esq. Her remains were interred on the fol-

lowing Saturday, in the Cemetery belonging to St. Andrew's parish, Gray's Inn Lane, Holborn. This afflictive dispensation of Providence was improved at Leather Lane,—in the morning by the Rev. Mr. Barrett, from 2 Tim. iv. 7, 8. *I have fought a good fight, &c.* and in the afternoon, by the Rev. J. Evans, from Numbers, xxiii. 10. *Let me die the death of the righteous, &c.* Her life indeed was the life of the righteous,—and her latter end was like unto his! Her piety to God—her benevolence to the poor—her kind behaviour towards all, justly endeared her to those who had the pleasure of being acquainted with her. A better wife and a better mother never existed. Her loss therefore to her own immediate relatives, her husband and children, is irreparable. But they have reason to be grateful to the Supreme Being for having spared her to them so long, and for having enabled her when the fatal period came, to sustain her short and very painful illness with an exemplary fortitude and resignation. Nor will her afflicted partner, together with the bereaved children, those memorials of their mutual love and affection, forget to realize those substantially consoling words of the apostle—*I would not have you to be ignorant brethren concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not as others which have no hope, for if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him.*

At Brixton, near Clapham, died, November 23, 1808, Mrs. JANE POOL, in the 72nd year of her age. Left a widow in early life, she supplied the loss of her highly esteemed partner by her prudence, industry and integrity, so as to bring up her family with comfort and respectability. She had for some few years past retired from business but was latterly worn down by a painful disease—of which the best medical assistance could only afford a temporary alleviation—

A few soft nights and balmy days impart!

Her funeral sermon was preached at Worship Street, (of which place she was an old and worthy member) by the Rev. J. Evans, from Lamen. iii. 26. *It is good that we should both hope and quietly wait for the salvation of the Lord.* He had been in the habit of visiting her and of administering to her the Lord's supper during her very severe indis-

688 *Intelligence.—Constitution of Unitarian Society, Philadelphia.*

sition. Indeed he never witnessed a more entire resignation to the will of heaven. Her calm and quiet departure was a memorable instance of the triumphs of Christianity.

December 22^d, 1808, at the house of her husband the Rev. W. Vidler, at Westham, Mrs. VIDLER, after a long and painful illness.

Nov. 11,—In his 60th year, the Rev. ROCHEMONT BARBAULD, of Stoke Newington. [Of this gentleman we have obtained a *Memoir*, which will appear in the SUPPLEMENT.]

Dec. 5,—WILLIAM HAWES, M.D. at his house in Spital Square. [A *Memoir* of this gentleman also will be given in the SUPPLEMENT.]

INTELLIGENCE.

CONSTITUTION OF THE FIRST SOCIETY OF UNITARIAN CHRISTIANS IN THE CITY OF PHILADELPHIA, ADOPTED 23, 1807.

Preliminary Declaration.—1. That this Society claims, and by the present act exercises, the right, which as intelligent and accountable beings they possess, and which is guaranteed to them by the excellent constitution of their country, of judging for themselves in matters of religion, and of performing the social acts thereof in that form and manner which conscience dictates as most rational, decent and acceptable.

2. That the only proper object of supreme adoration and worship is the *One living and true God the Father*, in whom they believe as the Maker of the heavens, the earth, and all things therein.

3. That they receive the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the authentic records of his revealed will to mankind.

4. That they cordially and thankfully acknowledge *Jesus Christ* as the Son of God, the promised Messiah—to whom all obedience ought to be rendered as to the distinguished and approved messenger of the love of God to the human race—whom he raised from the dead—and by whom he will, at the last day, recal all mankind to life and render unto them according to their works.

5. That they believe the *Holy Spirit* to be that extraordinary, divine energy and power, which was granted to prophets and holy men of old, but which was manifested pre-eminently in Christ, and afterwards in his Apostles and other believers of the primitive age, whereby they were enabled to bear miraculous testimony to the truth of the Gospel, and to spread it through all nations of the world.

Being moreover of opinion that every Christian Society constitutes a complete Church within itself, with power to establish regulations for the conduct of

its affairs, so that the same be not contrary to the word of God, and to revise, alter and amend them as may appear to be needful, they ordain and consent to (as on the whole best adapted to their present situation) the following

RULES.

1. *Public Worship*.—1. All the devotional services of this Society shall be addressed to the ONE GOD and FATHER of all, in the name of the *one mediator JESUS CHRIST*, in conformity with the foregoing declaration.

2. The doors of their place of worship shall be open to all persons whatsoever.

3. The stated periods for the celebration of the Lord's Supper shall be the first Sunday in the months of February, April, June, August, October, and December; but an extraordinary celebration may at any other time be had on reasons stated and previous notice given.

4. Every person, whether connected with the Society or not, shall be admitted to a participation of this ordinance, who maintains a serious and proper behaviour, and who has not been notoriously guilty, or does not live in the practice of any flagrant breach of decency and good morals.

II *Qualification, Admission and Exclusion of Members*.—1. Persons of either sex, of full age, and who contribute in their own right, not less than four dollars per annum to the funds of the Society, may become members thereof and vote in its proceedings, having first subscribed the declaration and rules. Provided nevertheless, that if by reason of poverty, any member be rendered unable to continue his or her contribution to the said amount, he or she shall not on that account be disqualified.

2. Every person previous to admission

shall be recommended by two or more actual members; and if any question arise thereupon the same shall be determined by ballot of the members then present.

3. Applications for admission shall be made to the committee of management, and be by them communicated to the Society.

4. Contributors to the funds of the Society, who have not subscribed the rules, cannot be considered as members nor be entitled to vote, except in the choice of a Pastor, for which a contribution to any amount shall qualify; provided it have been regularly paid quarterly for twelve months previous to the election, and the contributor have been in the habit of constant attendance on the meetings of the Society.

5. Any member whose contribution shall be twelve months in arrear and, receiving notice from the Treasurer, does not within fourteen days discharge the same, shall be considered as having withdrawn from the Society although he have not explicitly declared his intentions so to do.

6. As it is the duty of every Christian Society to watch over the moral conduct of its members, and cases may occur in which admonition or exclusion may become necessary, it shall be lawful to have recourse to either of these expedients—provided, that of whatever nature the complaint may be, it shall be distinctly stated in writing, signed with the name of the complainant, and exhibited to the committee of management, who shall employ every proper means to remove the cause of offence. If their endeavours prove ineffectual, the case may be brought in the like form before the Society at large, who if they see fit, may appoint a special committee to examine the business and make speedy report thereon. Judgment shall be given by the Society, in the way of ballot, for acquittal, admonition or expulsion, as the case may of right and justice require—if for expulsion, it shall be carried into effect by the erasure of the offender's name from the list of members and exclusion from the Lord's Supper. A record of the whole proceeding shall be entered on the books of the Society, and the unanimous vote of a general meeting shall be necessary to the re-admission of such excluded member.

7. A similar course shall be pursued when any member, feeling aggrieved, shall demand an enquiry into his or her

conduct; and in either case, the vote of the person or persons immediately interested shall not be admitted.

III. *Election and dismissal of a Pastor.*

—1. When any person desirous of undertaking the office of Pastor, shall have given satisfactory proof of his qualifications for the same, any three members of the Society may nominate him for election at the conclusion of a public meeting for worship. The election shall take place at the like meeting next following the nomination, and if no contrary opinion appear he shall be considered as duly elected—if otherwise, it shall be determined by way of ballot; and the votes of three fourths of the whole number of qualified electors present shall be necessary to a choice.

2. The pastor immediately upon his election shall sign the declaration and rules, if he have not done it before.

3. He shall not be eligible as one of the committee of management, but may give his vote as any other member of the Society.

4. In case of his declining the office, he shall give as early notice of his intention so to do as circumstances will admit.

5. If any cause of complaint arise as to the conduct or public services of the Pastor, the same shall be distinctly stated in writing, signed by at least three members, and exhibited to the committee of management, who shall take it into mature consideration; and if the complaint be persisted in, it shall be their duty to lay the same before the Society at the conclusion of any public meeting for worship. A day for a special meeting shall then be fixed, at which the business shall be fully discussed, and order be taken by way of ballot, by a majority of voters present, having the same qualifications as for the choice of a Pastor, for discontinuance of the proceedings, for suspension of the Pastor's functions, or for his final dismissal—and in the latter case the pecuniary emolument to which he may have been entitled for his services, shall be continued, in proportion to the annual amount, for six months from the time of decision.

IV. *General Meetings.*—A General annual meeting of the Society shall be held on the fourth Sunday in the month of December, immediately after morning service; and special meetings may be at any time held, such previous notice being given for that purpose as the business to be transacted may appear to require.

610 *Intelligence.—Constitution of Unitarian Society, Philadelphia.*

V. *Officers.*—1. Five persons, members of the Society, shall constitute a committee of management (a majority of whom shall be a quorum) and shall be chosen by ballot at the general annual meeting in December.

2. As soon as chosen, they shall nominate from among themselves a Treasurer and Secretary.

3. All special general meetings shall be called by the committee, except in cases where it is otherwise provided, and they shall be bound to call any such meeting at the request in writing of any three members.

4. They shall make all contracts on behalf of the Society, and two of them at least, of whom the Treasurer is not one, shall countersign all bills before they be paid by him.

5. No person except the Pastor shall be admitted to perform any part of the public service or worship without the consent of the committee; and it shall be their duty to appoint a suitable person or persons for that purpose either at the request of the Pastor, or in case of his absence, inability, suspension, or the vacancy of the office.

6. It shall also be within the province of the committee to provide for and regulate any extraordinary act of worship, other than that of the Lord's day morning and afternoon, which the Society may think proper to observe or institute.

7. Vacancies in the Committee by death, resignation or otherwise shall be supplied by ballot at a general meeting.

8. The powers of the committee shall extend generally to whatever may be necessary for the accommodation of the Society at their meetings, either for worship

or business, and to the promotion of the interest and views thereof—provided, that they keep a record of their proceedings, and report the same whensoever required by the Society, who may either confirm or annul any of their regulations as to them shall seem fit.

VI. *Funds of the Society.*—1. A book shall be kept with the names of subscribers and the amount of their contributions; distinction being made between those who are members and others.

2. Contributions, whether stated or casual, shall be received at the close of public worship on the third Sunday in March, June, September, and December, (due notice being previously given) and placed in the hands of the Treasurer.

3. The Treasurer's accounts shall be audited by the committee of management, and produced at the annual meeting when the balance shall be paid over to his successor.

4. Appropriations of the balance shall be made at the December meeting, at which time a certain sum shall be retained as a stock in hand, over which the committee shall have no control without the authority of a general meeting held for that purpose.

VII. *Amendments of the Rules.*—Can only be made at a general meeting held for the purpose, with sufficient previous notice and a particular statement in writing, of the alteration contemplated; and the votes of three fourths of the members present shall be necessary to give it validity.

VIII. *Baptism.*—A diversity of opinion respecting Baptism appearing to prevail in the Society, the consideration of that subject is for the present deferred.

WILTSHIRE CONFERENCE OF GENERAL BAPTISTS.

On Tuesday the 25th and Wednesday the 26th of last month, the ninth half yearly meeting of this Conference, was held at Trowbridge, Wilts; where, according to previous appointment, Messrs. Smedley, Aldridge and Kingsford, preached; the subject of Mr. Smedley on Tuesday evening, was "The Doctrine of Regeneration," that of Mr. Aldridge on Wednesday afternoon, "The Advantages of Religion," and that of Mr. Kingsford on Wednesday evening, "The Excellency of the Christian Temper."—Messrs. Hook, Jones, and Webley, also assisted in the devotional parts of the service.

The extreme unfavourableness of the weather prevented several ministers from attending, but the audience on the whole was numerous.—At the conclusion of the public service on Wednesday evening, Mr. Jones announced that the Lord's supper was about to be administered, and invited all professing Christians present to join in the participation of it, regardless of all party distinctions; but such was the force of Calvinistic prejudice, that, though a numerous company of spectators remained, not many besides General Baptists communicated.

In the transaction of business, to which the morning part of Wednesday was devoted, nothing of importance occurred; the state of the churches appeared to be nearly the same as at the last meeting, i. e. on the whole prosperous.

It was agreed that the next meeting should be held at Downton, on Wednesday and Thursday in the Easter week, 1809. and that Mr. Kingsford should preach the first sermon on Providence, Mr. Webley the second on Humility, and Mr. Jones the third, on the co-operation of churches with their ministers.

D. J.

Trowbridge, Nov. 19, 1808.

A COMPLETE LIST OF NEW PUBLICATIONS ON MORALS AND THEOLOGY IN DECEMBER, 1808.

A Sermon, occasioned by the death of the Rev. Theophilus Lindsey, M.A. Preached at the Chapel in Essex Street, Strand, Nov. 13, 1808: To which is added a brief Biographical Memoir, by Thomas Belsham, Minister of the Chapel. 8vo. 2s.

The Duty and Reward of sacrificing Temporal Interests on the Altar of Truth, exemplified in the Character of Abraham. A Sermon, preached at the Gravel Pit Meeting, Hackney, Nov. 20, 1808, on occasion of the Death of the Rev. Theophilus Lindsey, M.A. Including a Memoir of the deceased by a Friend. By Robert Aspland, 8vo. 1s. 6d.

The Christian Hero: A Sermon, preached at the Meeting-house, Wolverhampton Street, Dudley, Nov. 13, 1808; on occasion of the Death of the Rev. Theophilus Lindsey, M.A. By James Hews Bransby. 8vo. 1s.

The Nature, Origin and Effect of the Creation by Jesus Christ, considered in a Discourse, delivered at Ditchling, in Sussex, before the Southern Unitarian Book Society, on Wednesday, July, 13, 1808. By Russel Scott. 12mo.

A Search after Truth, in a Dialogue between Criton and Philo, by R. Bradburn, formerly a Local Preacher amongst the Methodists. 4d.

Walks of Usefulness in London and its Environs. By J. Campbell. 2s. half-bound.

The History of Hannah and Samuel, adapted to the Use of Societies, instituted for the Relief of Lying-in Women. 3d.

NOTICE.

MRS. CAPPE, has in the Press a *History of the Life of Christ*, in the words of the Four Evangelists.—The Events arranged in a regular Series, including the various important Transactions, Conversations, Precepts, and Admonitions, recorded by them of their Divine Master, and illustrated by many Notes and Observations formerly transcribed from the Short-hand Papers of her late Husband, the Rev. Newcome Cappe. The Work is divided into Sections, and accompanied by such Reflections as appeared to rise out of the several Subjects; and its Object, to throw new Light on such Passages as must necessarily seem obscure when not taken in their proper connection, also to convey to the mind of the Reader a comprehensive View of the whole History, and thereby to excite our increased Attention, and consequently a more lively Interest in the perusal of the Sacred Records.

CORRESPONDENCE.

MRS. CAPPE'S CORRECTION OF HER MEMOIR OF MR. LINDSEY.

The following Letter did not arrive in time for the proposed correction. We cannot do better therefore than print it as sent to us, hoping that the amiable writer will excuse our inserting a communication not intended for the public eye.

To the Editor of the *Monthly Repository*.

SIR,

York, Dec. 7th 1808.

I am very sorry to give you this trouble and more for the occasion of it, but I have just discovered on reading Mr. Belham's excellent Sermon and Memoir that my memory has played me truant respecting the time when Mr. Lindsey

had the offer of going as Chaplain to the Duke of Northumberland to Ireland. Mr. E. places it before his leaving Piddletown—whereas I have said it was whilst he was at Catterick—that I was there, and that I saw the letter.—That I did see the letter is certain, but it must have been shewn me by Mrs. L. sometime after the transaction. The fact is that my father died in July 1763. Mr. L. removed to Catterick the latter end of that year; the Earl of N—d was appointed Viceroy of Ireland in September, about which time the offer must have been made.

I must beg the favour, therefore, that the memoir I sent you a week ago, and which I hope you have received, may be altered in the following manner, and I hope this letter will arrive in time to prevent your having a great deal of trouble. The former part of the paragraph, which succeeds that where mention is made of Mr. Lindsey's Sunday evening must be altered as follows. "Although Mr. L. had so far quieted his scruples, as to continue in the Church, he had long firmly resolved never to accept any higher preferment, and had refused repeated offers from others, but especially from the Duchess of N—d, who was exceedingly solicitous to fulfil the promise made to her dying parent, of placing him in affluence. Accordingly when the Duke was appointed Viceroy of Ireland, about the time of Mr. L.'s leaving Piddletown, she wrote, &c." The narrative to remain unaltered till after the words "new and untried,"—then the assertion that I was at Catterick at the time, in which my memory must have deceived me, to be erased.—Then proceed thus, "—Mr. Lindsey's reply was full of gratitude for the offered kindness, but the refusal was firm and decisive" leaving out the next two lines, go on "The Duchess made one effort more, &c." to the end of that paragraph. The beginning of the next must be changed and what follows substituted in its room. "After my late venerable friend had resided at Catterick sometime, a rheumatic fever which brought him apparently to the brink of the grave renewed his scruples about continuing in the Church, and as he himself states, he secretly, but firmly resolved to seek an opportunity to relinquish a situation that was now become not very supportable."* The petition presented to Parliament not long afterwards, for relief in the affair of Subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles, caused some delay in the execution of this determination till its fate should be finally decided; but Mr. L. had anticipated almost from the first, what would probably be the result, and was making silent and gradual preparation for the event that was to ensue," &c. &c.

I wish I may have expressed myself intelligibly, but I write in great haste, at night, after having been writing almost the whole day before this vexatious discovery.

I remain, dear Sir,

Your sincere friend,

C. CAPPE.

The Memoir of the late Rev. John Edwards, promised in the present number is unavoidably postponed for the SUPPLEMENT, which will be published on Monday, January 16, 1809, when the present Volume will be completed. Our Readers are requested to give particular orders for the SUPPLEMENTARY NUMBER, without which their copies of the present Volume will be imperfect, and not to trust entirely to their booksellers, who may forget to procure it.

The Unitarian Christian's Letter, from the Isle of Wight has been received, and the note enclosed been applied to the purpose for which it was intended.

The following Communications have been received, and are under consideration. "W. C. on Mr. Higginson's Vindication of Dr. Percival." "H. W. on the Socinian Controversy." "Calculator, on the Account of the Tract Society." "John Lawn on Mr. Belsham's Letters to Dr. Smith." "Veritas and Laicus."

The following are intended for insertion.—"J. W. on the existence of the Devil." 2d part. "Anti-Baptists." "A Yorkshire Correspondent on Mr. Jones's Illustrations." "J. T.'s Address on the Death of Mr. Lindsey." "Mr. Drummond, of Ipswich, on the refusal of Burial to Unitarians." "Sonnet to the Memory of Mr. Lindsey."

The Account of the "Meeting or Talk of Indians" shall be inserted in the Supplement, as requested, if we find it practicable.

* Apology, page 231.